Augustin's Method - Part I: The Renyi Center

Barış Nakiboğlu

Canım halam Fatma Nakiboğlu Aydiç'in anısına adanmıştır.
Dedicated to the memory of my dear aunt Fatma Nakiboğlu Aydiç.

Abstract

A self contained presentation of Renyi's information quantities —power mean, Renyi information, Renyi divergence, Renyi mean, Renyi capacity, Renyi radius and Renyi center— is provided. Erven-Harremoes conjecture is proved for any positive order and for any set of probability measures on a given measurable space. A generalization of Erven-Harremoes conjecture is established for the constrained variant of the problem. Finiteness of the order α Renyi capacity is shown to imply the continuity of the Renyi capacity on $(0,\alpha]$ and the uniform equicontinuity of the Renyi information, both as a family of functions of the order indexed by the priors and as a family of functions of the prior indexed by the orders. The Renyi capacities and the Renyi centers of various shift invariant families of probability measures on the unit interval and various families of Poisson processes are derived as examples.

arXiv:1608.02424v2 [cs.IT] 21 Nov 2016

CONTENTS

I Introduction 2
I-A Main Contributions . . . 4
I-B Notational Conventions . . . 5

II Preliminaries 6
II-A The Weighted Power Mean of Probability Measures . . . 6
II-B The Renyi Information . . . 8
II-C The Renyi Divergence . . . 9
II-D The Renyi Mean and The Alternative Characterization of The Renyi Information . . . 11

III The Renyi Capacity 12
III-A The Renyi Capacity as a Function of The Order . . . 12
III-B Finiteness of The Renyi Capacity . . . 14
III-C The Renyi Radius and Max-Min Inequality . . . 19

IV The Renyi Center and The Alternative Characterization of The Renyi Capacity 19
IV-A Minimax Theorems and The Relative Compactness . . . 20
IV-B Erven-Harremoes Bound and The Renyi Center as a Function of The Order . . . 23
IV-C The Renyi Capacity Of Unions, Cartesian Products, Closures, and More . . . 24

V Examples 29
V-A Certain Families of Probability Measures on Discrete Output Spaces . . . 29
V-B Shift Invariant Families of Probability Measures on The Unit Interval . . . 31
V-C Certain Families of Simple Poisson Point Processes With Integrable Intensity Functions . . . 32

VI Discussion and Future Directions 37

Appendix 38
A Proofs of The Lemmas on Weighted Power Means of Probability Measures . . . 38
B Proofs of The Lemmas on The Renyi Information . . . 41
C Proofs of The Lemmas on The Renyi Divergence . . . 42
D Proof of The Lemma on The Alternative Characterization of The Renyi Information . . . 48
E The Ergodic Theorem: A Tool For Determining The Renyi Capacity . . . 49
F The Constrained Renyi Capacity . . . 50
G The Renyi Capacity of Transition Probabilities . . . 51

References 52

e-mail:nakib@alum.mit.edu

I. Introduction

Augustin [4] derived the sphere packing bound for product channels using the equality of the Renyi capacity[1] and the Renyi radius together with the following observation: by choosing ϕ close enough to α, the order α relative Renyi radius with respect to the order ϕ Renyi center can be made arbitrarily close to the order α Renyi radius, which is equal to the order α relative Renyi radius with respect to the order α Renyi center.[2] This observation seems benign enough to hold for other parametric families of divergences and corresponding radii and centers. Hence, we believe that Augustin's method can be used to derive tight outer bounds in other information transmission problems, as well. Furthermore, —unlike its contemporaries by Shannon, Gallager and Berlekamp in [61] and by Haroutunian in [38]— Augustin's derivation of the sphere packing bound does not assume either the stationarity of the channel or the finiteness of the input set because it does not rely on a type based expurgation (i.e. a fixed composition argument). After decades, Augustin's proofs in [4] and [5] are still the only proofs of the sphere packing bound for non-stationary product channels.

Despite the novelty of its approach, the potential of its method, and the generality of its results, Augustin's derivation of the sphere packing bound is scarcely known today, even among the specialists working on related problems. In the second paper of this two part series, we derive sphere packing bounds using Augustin's method in a way that makes the roles of the Renyi capacity and the Renyi center more salient and precise. Our bound for the product channels is sharper than the corresponding bounds in [4] and [5]. For the stationary product channels with feedback, we present a new proof of the sphere packing bound that facilities the ideas of Haroutunian [39] and Sheverdyaev [64], as well as Augustin [4], [5]. The second paper also includes a more general discussion of the operational significance of the Renyi capacity and the Renyi information in the channel coding problem.

In this first paper of the two part series, we are interested in the Renyi capacity, the Renyi radius, and the Renyi center as measure theoretic quantities defined for any positive order α and set of probability measures $\mathcal{W}$ on a given measurable space $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$. The weighted power mean of probability measures, the Renyi information, the Renyi divergence, and the Renyi mean are defined and analyzed for completeness. Csiszar [19] has already presented a similar investigation for the case when $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are finite sets. However, the order α Renyi capacity is finite for any non-negative order α whenever either $\mathcal{W}$ or $\mathcal{Y}$ is finite. Hence, the relationship between the finiteness of Renyi capacity and the continuity of Renyi information —both as a function of the prior and as a function of the order— can not be investigated with such a model. Similarly, certain features of the Renyi capacity are non-trivial only for $\mathcal{W}$'s that are infinite: the invariance of the Renyi capacity under the closure operation on $\mathcal{W}$ or the existence of finite subsets of $\mathcal{W}$ with Renyi capacities that are arbitrarily close to the Renyi capacity of $\mathcal{W}$ uniformly. Augustin [4], [5] and Kemperman [45] have considered models with arbitrary $\mathcal{W}$'s on arbitrary measurable spaces while studying related problems.

Concepts of radius and center play important roles in our discussion. These concepts, as we use them, can be traced back to their counter parts in Euclidean geometry. Given a set of points $\mathcal{W}$ in n dimensional Euclidean space, one measure of the spread of $\mathcal{W}$ is the infimum of the radii of the spheres that include all points of $\mathcal{W}$, called the Chebyshev radius:

$$S_{\mathcal{W}} \triangleq \inf_{q \in \mathbb{R}^n} \sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \|w - q\|_2 \qquad \forall \mathcal{W} \subset \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Given a point q in the same space the relative Chebyshev radius of $\mathcal{W}$ with respect to q is the greatest lower bound on the radii of the spheres centered at q that include all points of $\mathcal{W}$:

$$S_{\mathcal{W}}(q) \triangleq \sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \|w - q\|_2 \qquad \forall \mathcal{W} \subset \mathbb{R}^n, q \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

If $S_{\mathcal{W}}$ is finite then there exists[3] a unique[4] Chebyshev center $q_{\mathcal{W}}$ satisfying $S_{\mathcal{W}}(q_{\mathcal{W}}) = S_{\mathcal{W}}$.

The Chebyshev radius is, in a sense, special because it is defined via the distance measure —the metric corresponding to the norm of the space for normed spaces, the metric of the space for metric spaces— that is a part of the description of the space. In principle, one can define spheres around the points of a space $\mathcal{X}$ using any non-negative function g on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ satisfying $g(x, x) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$:

$$\mathcal{B}_g(q, \varrho) \triangleq \{x \in \mathcal{X} : g(x, q) < \varrho\} \qquad \forall q \in \mathcal{X}, \quad \varrho \in \mathbb{R}^+.$$

Then one can measure the absolute and the relative spread of the subsets of $\mathcal{X}$ using these spheres:

$$S_{g,\mathcal{W}} \triangleq \inf_{q \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}} g(w, q) \qquad S_{g,\mathcal{W}}(q) \triangleq \sup_{w \in \mathcal{W}} g(w, q).$$

[1] Instead of the Renyi capacity $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$, Augustin [4] worked with the function $H(s, M)$ satisfying $H(\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}, \mathcal{W}) = \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. Furthermore, Augustin did not use the terms radius and center. Nevertheless, given the analysis presented in [4], it is evident that Augustin's understanding of the concepts of radius and center was uniquely mature, irrespective of the jargon he preferred to employ.

[2] This observation ($\lim_{\phi \to \alpha} S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(q_{\phi,\mathcal{W}}) = S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$) is related to the continuity of the Renyi radius $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ in α and the continuity of the Renyi center $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ in α, but it is not a direct consequence of them.

[3] The existence follows from the extreme value theorem for lower semicontinuous functions. The uniqueness is a result of the uniform convexity of finite dimensional Euclidean spaces.

[4] For any set of points in a metric space $(\mathcal{X}, d)$, one can define the Chebyshev radius by replacing $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mathcal{X}$ and $\|w - q\|_2$ with $d(w, q)$ in the definition. However, neither the existence nor the uniqueness of the Chebyshev center is a foregone conclusion for such generalizations. Garkavi [32, Theorem 1] provides a three point set in a Banach space that does not have a Chebyshev center. In the Hamming space of length two binary strings, both $(0, 0)$ and $(1, 1)$ are centers of the set $\mathcal{W} = \{(0, 1), (1, 0)\}$.

If there exists a point $q_{g,\mathcal{W}}$ such that $S_{g,\mathcal{W}}(q_{g,\mathcal{W}}) = S_{g,\mathcal{W}}$ then $q_{g,\mathcal{W}}$ is a g-center of $\mathcal{W}$. Neither the existence, nor the uniqueness of such a point is guaranteed in general.

When $\mathcal{X}$ in the above formulation is the space of all probability measures $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ on a measurable space $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, one can measure the spread of the subsets of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ using the Kullback-Leibler divergence by setting $g(w,q)$ to be $D(w\|\,q)$ for all probability measures w and q on $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$. Other divergences can be used to measure the spread, as well. In this paper, we use the Renyi divergences to measure the spread of subsets of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ for an arbitrary measurable space $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$.

In [57], Renyi provided an axiomatic characterization of a family of divergences for pairs of probability mass functions on a given finite sample space. Resulting family of divergences, parametrized by positive real numbers, are called the Renyi divergences. The order α Renyi divergence between probability measures w and q is denoted by $D_\alpha(w\|\,q)$. The Kullback-Leibler divergence is the order one Renyi divergence, i.e $D_1(w\|\,q) = D(w\|\,q)$. Erven and Harremoes [24] have recently published a comprehensive investigation of various properties of Renyi divergences. The radius and the center associated with the order α Renyi divergence are called the order α Renyi radius and the order α Renyi center. As it is the case for the Chebyshev radius and the Chebyshev center, finiteness of the Renyi radius $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ implies the existence and the uniqueness of the corresponding Renyi center $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$: If the order α Renyi radius $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ of a set of probability measures $\mathcal{W}$ is finite then $\mathcal{W}$ has a unique order α Renyi center $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ such that $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}) = S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$.

Another measure of the richness of a set of probability measures $\mathcal{W}$ is the supremum of the mutual informations $I(p;\mathcal{W})$ over all probability mass functions p on $\mathcal{W}$. Sibson [66] proposed a parametric generalization of the mutual information called Renyi information, using the parametric generalization of the Kullback-Leibler divergence proposed by Renyi [57]. The order α Renyi information[5] is denoted by $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$. For positive orders other than one, the order α Renyi information can be described in terms of Gallager's function $E_0(\rho,p)$ introduced in [28]:

$$I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) = \left.\frac{E_0(\rho,p)}{\rho}\right|_{\rho=\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}.$$

We define the order α Renyi capacity $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ as the supremum of the order α Renyi information. There are at least two other ways to define Renyi information for which the order one Renyi information is equal to the mutual information: one by Arimoto [3] and another one by Augustin [5] and Csiszar [19]. A review of these three definitions of the Renyi information has recently been published by Verdu [74]. The order α Renyi capacity for all three definitions of Renyi information are equal to one another and to the order α Renyi radius, as pointed out by Csiszar [19, Proposition 1].

The equality $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ and the existence and uniqueness $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for $\mathcal{W}$'s with finite $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ have been known for some time in various forms. For $\alpha = 1$ case the result is due to Kemperman[6] [45, Theorem 1]. For the case when both $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are finite sets Kemperman's result was already known at the time [30, Theorem 4.5.1]; in [45] Kemperman attributes this special case to Shannon [62]. For the case when $\mathcal{Y}$ is a finite set, first Gallager [29, Theorem A] and then Davisson and Leon-Garcia [22, Theorem 3] proved results equivalent to Kemperman's. Later, Haussler [40] proved Kemperman's result assuming $\mathcal{Y}$ is a complete separable metric space, i.e. Polish space, and $\mathcal{Y}$ is the associated Borel σ-algebra. Augustin[7] proved results [5, Theorem 26.6'] implying Kemperman's result for all orders in $\alpha \in (0,2)$. Csiszar [19, Proposition 1] proved the equality $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for arbitrary positive order α assuming $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are finite sets and pointed out the equality of the supremums of all three definitions of Renyi information. Erven and Harremoes [24, equation (57)] adopted the definition of Renyi information proposed by Csiszar [19] and Augustin [5] and proved $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for all $\alpha \in [0,\infty]$, assuming $\mathcal{Y}$ is a finite set [24, Theorem 34].

The equality of the capacity and the radius is not a phenomena, confined to Renyi's information quantities. Csiszar [14], [15] and Ali and Silvey [1] defined the f-divergence using convex functions. The Kullback-Leibler divergence is the f-divergence corresponding to the function $f(x) = x\ln x$. Although Renyi divergences of other orders are not f-divergences themselves, they can be written in terms of f-divergences:

$$D_\alpha(w\|\,q) = \left.\frac{\ln(1+(\alpha-1)\mathcal{D}_f(w\|q))}{\alpha-1}\right|_{f(x)=\frac{x^\alpha-1}{\alpha-1}} \qquad \forall\alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\}.$$

The f-information and f-capacity are defined in terms of corresponding f-divergence as follows.[8]

$$\mathcal{I}_f(p;\mathcal{W}) \triangleq \inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} \mathcal{D}_f(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\,p\otimes q) \qquad \mathcal{C}_{f,\mathcal{W}} = \sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} \mathcal{I}_f(p;\mathcal{W}).$$

The mutual information[9] is the f-information corresponding to the function $f(x) = x\ln x$. For $\mathcal{W}$'s that are finite, Csiszar [17,

[5]Sibson defines the quantity $\inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\,p\otimes q)$ to be the "information radius of order α" and denotes it by K_α. Sibson, then, derives a closed form expression for the value of K_α in [66, Theorem 2.2]. We take that value as the definition of the order α Renyi information.

[6]Kemperman's notation and nomenclature in [45] is different from ours. For Kemperman the order one Renyi divergence (i.e. the Kullback-Leibler divergence) is entropy, $D_1(w\|\,q)$ is $H(w|q)$, $S_{1,\mathcal{W}}$ is $C^*(\mathcal{W})$, and $q_{1,\mathcal{W}}$ is $\widetilde{\nu}_{\mathcal{W}}$.

[7]In [4] considering only the orders in $(0,1)$, Augustin proved an equivalent result for finite $\mathcal{W}$'s and described how it can be extended to arbitrary $\mathcal{W}$'s.

[8]In [17], Csiszar denotes $S_{\mathcal{D}_f,\mathcal{W}}$ by $\varrho_f(\mathcal{W})$ and calls $\mathcal{I}_f(p;\mathcal{W})$ the f-informativity rather than the f-information.

[9]The order α Renyi information, as defined by Sibson, can be written in terms of Csiszar's f-information:

$$I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) = \left.\frac{\ln(1+(\alpha-1)\mathcal{I}_f(p;\mathcal{W}))}{\alpha-1}\right|_{f(x)=\frac{x^\alpha-1}{\alpha-1}} \qquad \forall\alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\}.$$

Theorem 3.2] proved the following two assertions:

- $\mathcal{C}_{f,\mathcal{W}} = S_{\mathcal{D}_f,\mathcal{W}}$ for any f that is strictly convex at $x = 1$.
- There exists a unique f-center for any f that is strictly convex provided that $S_{\mathcal{D}_f,\mathcal{W}}$ is finite.

It seems for f's that are strictly convex both assertions of Csiszar [17, Theorem 3.2] can be extended to arbitrary $\mathcal{W}$'s using the technique employed by Kemperman in [45], as Kemperman himself suggested. Gushchin and Zhdanov [37] proved that the supremum of f-information is equal to $S_{\mathcal{D}_f,\mathcal{W}}$ for any convex function f and set of probability measures $\mathcal{W}$ provided that $\mathcal{Y}$ is a complete separable metric space, i.e. Polish space, and $\mathcal{Y}$ is the associated Borel σ-algebra.

Recently, there has been a revived interest in the Renyi divergence [59], [60], [63], the Renyi information [42], [74], and their operational significance [10], [27], [54], [72]. In addition, certain related quantities, such as the Renyi entropy [6], [56] and its variants [26], [70] have been used to pose projection problems [49], [50], [51] related to guessing [2], [68] and to pose various questions about the information transmission problems [9], [11], [41], [69].

A. Main Contributions

Generally speaking, our presentation is influenced by the works of Augustin [4], [5], Kemperman [45], Csiszar [17], [19] and Erven and Harremoes [24]. In order to have a self contained presentation, we have rederived some known results from scratch, sometimes with minor modifications. The following is a list of our contributions; ones mentioned in (I) and (II) are more important than the others in our judgment.

(I) When $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are finite sets, the continuity of the Renyi information is evident, both as a function of the order and as a function of the prior. Furthermore, Shannon Gallager and Berlekamp [61, p.101] proved the equicontinuity of the Renyi information as a family of functions of the order on $(0, 1)$ indexed by the priors, assuming $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are finite sets. Then, the uniform equicontinuity of the Renyi information on any compact subset of $(0, 1)$ follows from the standard results on compactness such as [23, Theorem 2.4.5]. We have strengthened this result by replacing the finiteness hypothesis on the sets $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ with a finiteness hypothesis for the Renyi capacity and by including orders larger than one. In addition, we have shown that the Renyi information is uniformly equicontinuous when considered as a family of functions of the prior indexed by the orders. In particular, we have shown that[10]

  (a) If $C_{z,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$ then the Renyi information as a family of functions of the prior indexed by the order is uniformly equicontinuous for orders in $[0, z]$, Lemma 12-(d).

  (b) If $C_{z,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$ then the Renyi information as a family of functions of the order indexed by the prior is uniformly equicontinuous on any compact subset of $(0, z)$, Lemma 12-(e).

(II) Reflecting on their result [24, Theorem 37] for countable $\mathcal{Y}$'s at $\alpha = \infty$, Erven and Harremoes [24, Conjecture 1] have recently inferred the following: For any set of probability measures $\mathcal{W}$ on a measurable space $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$, if $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is finite for an α in $(0, \infty]$ then

$$\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} D_\alpha(w\| q) \geq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} + D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}\| q) \qquad \forall q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$$

where $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is the unique order α Renyi center of $\mathcal{W}$.
Lemma 16 proves this conjecture to be true. We are not aware of any prior proof[11] of [24, Conjecture 1]. Lemma 16 implicitly assumes the existence and the uniqueness of the order α Renyi center $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. This is explicitly stated as a part of [24, Conjecture 1]. We prove this claim using Kemperman's approach [45], see Theorem 1. However, this initial part of [24, Conjecture 1] is not new. Augustin has already proved an equivalent claim for orders between zero and two in [5, Theorem 26.6'] and gave a proof sketch for an equivalent claim for orders between zero and one in [4].
In Appendix F, we consider the constrained capacity for subsets of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ and establish the following generalization of the Erven-Harremoes bound: For any set of probability measures $\mathcal{W}$ on a measurable space $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$, if $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A})$ is finite for a convex subset $\mathcal{A}$ of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ and an α in $(0, \infty]$ then

$$\sup_{p\in\mathcal{A}} D_\alpha(p \circ \mathcal{W}\| p \otimes q) \geq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A}) + D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,\mathcal{A}}\| q) \qquad \forall q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$$

where $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{A}}$ is the unique order α Renyi center of $\mathcal{A}$. (see Lemma 22).

(III) We define $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for an arbitrary set of probability measures $\mathcal{W}$ on a given measurable space. This framework allows us to pose certain questions that are non-trivial only for infinite $\mathcal{W}$'s.
Let $\mathcal{W}$ be a set of probability measures on a measurable space $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$, i.e. $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$.

  (a) There exists a countable subset $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$ of $\mathcal{W}$ such that $C_{\alpha,\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for all $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$, Lemma 11-(b).

[10]Our definition of the Renyi information, i.e. Definition 4, is restricted to the set of priors that are probability mass functions on finite subsets of $\mathcal{W}$. This restriction allows us to define and discuss Renyi information without qualifying our statements, but it is not necessary. In Appendix G, we define Renyi information for a broader class of priors using the concept of transition probability. It seems proofs of Lemmas 12-(d) and 12-(e) work with appropriate modifications for this more general framework.

[11]After the release of the current paper on arXiv, author has learned from Peter Harremoes that at the time they stated their conjecture Erven and Harremoes had a partial result proving their conjecture under some regularity conditions with a long and complicated proof.

(b) If $C_{z,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$ then $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists$ a finite subset $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$ of $\mathcal{W}$ such that $C_{\alpha,\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}} > C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} - \epsilon$ for all $\alpha \in [\epsilon, z]$, Lemma 11-(g).
(c) $C_{\alpha,\mathtt{cl}\mathcal{W}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for all $\alpha \in (0,\infty]$ where $\mathtt{cl}\mathcal{W}$ is the closure of $\mathcal{W}$ in the topology of setwise convergence or a stronger topology on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, Lemma 21-(b).[12]

(IV) Lemma 20 is a new result demonstrating an intuitively evident fact: For any $\mathcal{W}$ such that $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$ and $\epsilon > 0$, let $\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}$ be the set of $w \in \mathcal{W}$ satisfying $D_\alpha(w \| q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}) \geq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} - \epsilon$. Then $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ and $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} = q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. Furthermore, $|C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} - I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) - D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,p} \| q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}})| \leq \epsilon$ for all $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)})$.

(V) Two of our rederivations are preferable to the original proofs by Augustin [5], because they untangle the presentation of the concepts and lead to a neater development:
(a) The Renyi capacity is either a continuous function of the order on $(0,\infty]$ or a function of the order that is continuous and bounded on $(0,x]$ and infinite on $(x,\infty]$ for an x in $[1,\infty)$, by Lemma 11. Our proof of Lemma 11 does not rely on the equality $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$, or the existence and the uniqueness of Renyi center, i.e. Theorem 1. We deduce the continuity of the Renyi center in the order for the total variation topology, i.e. Lemma 17, from the continuity of the Renyi capacity using Erven-Harremoes bound, i.e. Lemma 16.
Augustin derives similar results [5, Theorem 26.6'] as well, but he develops two continuity results together. As a separate note, we are unable to confirm the continuity of the Renyi capacity from the right at $\alpha = 1$ using his proof sketch.
(b) The set $\mathcal{W}$ has compact closure in the topology of setwise convergence iff $\lim_{\alpha\uparrow 1} \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = 0$, by Lemma 21-(d). Our proof of Lemma 21-(d) is measure theoretic and self contained.
Augustin's proof of Lemma 21-(d) uses Gallager's inner bound [28, Theorem 1] and a different characterization of the compactness of the closure he derives in [5].

(VI) (a) In [5], Augustin determined the Renyi capacity and the Renyi center of certain shift invariant sets of probability measures on the unit interval;[13] we present this rich family of examples in Section V-B. Furthermore, we demonstrate in Appendix E that the ergodic theorem can be used to determine their Renyi capacity and Renyi center.
(b) In Section V-C, we calculate the Renyi capacity and the Renyi center of various families of Poisson processes. Some of these families have been considered before [12], [21], [44], [75], [76] in the context of channel coding problems, such as the ones described in equations (101) and (103), others have not been considered even in that context, such as the ones described in equations (100) and (102).

B. Notational Conventions

We denote integrals by $\int f(y)\nu(\mathrm{d}y)$ or $\int f\nu(\mathrm{d}y)$ rather than $\int f(y)\mathrm{d}\nu$ or $\int f\mathrm{d}\nu$. When discussing convergence of a sequences of functions, we denote $\nu-$almost everywhere convergence by $\xrightarrow{\nu-a.e.}$, convergence in measure for ν by $\xrightarrow{\nu}$ and convergence in variation, i.e. $\mathcal{L}_1(\nu)$ convergence, by $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_1(\nu)}$. If ν is a probability measure then integral of f is also called the expectation of f or the expected value of f. We denote it by $\mathbf{E}[f]$ or $\mathbf{E}[f(\mathsf{Y})]$. When discussing multiple probability measures, we add the measure used in the expectation as a subscript in order to avoid confusion: $\mathbf{E}_\nu[f]$ or $\mathbf{E}_\nu[f(\mathsf{Y})]$.

Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space and μ, ν be two measures on $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$. Measure μ is dominated by ν, i.e. $\mu \ll \nu$, iff $\mu(\mathcal{E}) \leq \nu(\mathcal{E})$ for all $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{Y}$ and absolutely continuous with respect to ν, i.e. $\mu \prec \nu$, iff $\mu(\mathcal{E}) = 0$ for any $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $\nu(\mathcal{E}) = 0$. Measures μ and ν are equivalent, i.e. $\mu \sim \nu$, iff $\mu \prec \nu$ and $\nu \prec \mu$. Measures μ and ν are singular, i.e. $\mu \perp \nu$, iff there exists a $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $\mu(\mathcal{E}) = \nu(\mathcal{Y} \setminus \mathcal{E}) = 0$. For any signed measure μ on $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ total variation norm of μ is defined as

$$\|\mu\| \triangleq \sup_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{Y}} \mu(\mathcal{E}) - \mu(\mathcal{Y} \setminus \mathcal{E}).$$

As a consequence of the Lebesgue decomposition theorem [23, 5.5.3] and the Radon-Nikodym theorem [23, 5.5.4] we have

$$\|\mu\| = \int \left|\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right| \nu(\mathrm{d}y) \qquad \forall \mu,\nu : \mu \prec \nu.$$

On a measurable space $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, we denote the set of all finite signed measures, the set of all finite measures, the set of all non-zero finite measures, and the set of all probability measures by $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, $\mathcal{M}_0^+(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, and $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, respectively.

A set $\mathcal{W}$ of measures on $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ is absolutely continuous in ν, i.e. $\mathcal{W} \prec \nu$, iff $w \prec \nu$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$. A σ-finite measure ν is a reference measure for $\mathcal{W}$, iff $\mathcal{W} \prec \nu$. Unless $\mathcal{W}$ is a finite subset of $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, the existence of such a reference measure is not guaranteed. A stronger form of absolute continuity for sets of measures that emerge in our analysis is the uniformly absolutely continuity. [7, Definition 4.5.2]: A set of measures $\mathcal{W}$ on $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ is uniformly absolutely continuous with respect to ν, i.e. $\mathcal{W} \prec^{uni} \nu$, iff for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $w(\mathcal{E}) < \epsilon$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$ provided that $\nu(\mathcal{E}) < \delta$. It is easy to verify that $\mu \prec \nu$ iff $\{\mu\} \prec^{uni} \nu$, see [65, p.366 Theorem 2].

Given a measurable space $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ a finite subset $\mathcal{E}$ of $\mathcal{Y}$ is called a partition of $\mathcal{Y}$ measurable in $\mathcal{Y}$, iff $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{E} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{E}} = \emptyset$ for all $\mathcal{E}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}} \in \mathcal{E}$ and $\cup_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} = \mathcal{Y}$.

[12] Csiszar and Korner pointed out the equality $S_{1,\mathtt{cl}\mathcal{W}} = S_{1,\mathcal{W}}$ for the case when $\mathcal{Y}$ is a finite set in [20, Problems 8.10(b)].
[13] To be precise we should say Augustin's results in [5] can be understood as such.

For any set $\mathcal{X}$, we denote the set of all subsets of $\mathcal{X}$ by $2^{\mathcal{X}}$ and the set of all probability measures on finite subsets of $\mathcal{X}$ by $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. We call each member p of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ a probability mass function (p.m.f.) and denote the set of all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ for which $p(x) > 0$ by $\mathcal{X}_p$.

We denote Cartesian product of sets [23, p38] by $\times$. We denote product of topologies [23, p.38], σ-algebras [23, p.118] and measures [23, Theorem 4.4.4] by $\otimes$, it will be clear from the context which one is meant. Similarly, we use $|\cdot|$ to denote the absolute value of real numbers and the size of sets. We denote the set of real numbers with $\mathbb{R}$, positive real numbers by $\mathbb{R}^+$, integer by $\mathbb{Z}$ and rational numbers by $\mathbb{Q}$. For any real number x, $\lfloor x \rfloor$ is the greatest integer less than x and $\lceil x \rceil$ is the least integer greater than x. We denote maximum and minimum among a finite number of choices by $\vee$ and $\wedge$, respectively.

II. Preliminaries

We commence this section by defining and analyzing the weighted power means of probability measures. Then we define the Renyi information using the weighted power means and analyze it both as a function of the order and as a function of the prior. After that we define the Renyi divergence and rederive certain well known facts about it. We conclude the section by defining the Renyi mean and deriving an alternative expression for the Renyi information in terms of the Renyi divergence using the Renyi mean. Proofs of the lemmas of this section are deferred to the appendices.

A. The Weighted Power Mean of Probability Measures

The weighted power means are generalizations of the weighted arithmetic mean. For any positive real number α and p.m.f. p on non-negative real numbers, the order α mean for the prior p is $(\sum_x p(x)x^\alpha)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$. For any prior p, the order α weighted mean[14] is an increasing and continuously differentiable function of the order α on $\mathbb{R}^+$. Hence, we can calculate its limit as the order approaches to zero and as the order approaches to infinity using l'Hospital's rule [58, Theorem 5.13]:

$$\lim_{\alpha\to 0}\left(\sum\nolimits_x p(x)x^\alpha\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} = \prod\nolimits_x x^{p(x)} \qquad\qquad \lim_{\alpha\to\infty}\left(\sum\nolimits_x p(x)x^\alpha\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} = \bigvee\nolimits_{x:p(x)>0} x$$

The order α mean of probability measures for the prior p is defined via the pointwise order α mean of their Radon-Nikodym derivatives for the prior p. The same expression can be used to define the order α mean of finite measures that are not necessarily probability measures.

Definition 1. Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space, p be a p.m.f. on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, and ν be a reference measure for $\mathcal{X}_p$. Then *the order α mean of the Radon-Nikodym derivatives for the prior p* is[15]

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} \triangleq \begin{cases} \prod_{w:p(w)>0}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{p(w)} & \text{if } \alpha = 0 \\ \left(\sum_w p(w)\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^\alpha\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} & \text{if } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+ \\ \bigvee_{w:p(w)>0}\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\nu} & \text{if } \alpha = \infty \end{cases} \qquad \nu - \text{almost everywhere.} \tag{1}$$

The order α mean measure for the prior p is

$$\mu_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{E}) \triangleq \int_{\mathcal{E}} \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\nu(\mathrm{d}y) \qquad\qquad \forall \mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{Y}. \tag{2}$$

The reference measure ν in Definition 1 does not appear in the symbol for the mean measure because mean measure does not depend on the choice of the reference measure: let $\widetilde{\mu_{\alpha,p}}$ be the mean measure obtained using the reference measure $\widetilde{\nu}$ for $\mathcal{X}_p$ instead of ν in Definition 1, then

$$\mu_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{E}) = \widetilde{\mu_{\alpha,p}}(\mathcal{E}) \qquad\qquad \forall \alpha \in [0,\infty] \text{ and } \forall \mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{Y}.$$

This follows from a standard application[16] of the Lebesgue decomposition theorem and the Radon-Nikodym theorem.

[14] In [5, Section 26], Augustin uses the term harmonic mean for negative orders and the term quasi-arithmetic mean for positive orders.

[15] For each $w \in \mathcal{X}_p$, the Radon-Nikodym derivative $\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\nu}$ exists for all y except for a ν-measure zero set by the Radon-Nikodym theorem [23, 5.5.4]. Since $\mathcal{X}_p$ is a finite set, y's for which $\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\nu}$ does not exist for a w in $\mathcal{X}_p$ is a ν-measure zero set, as well. Then the function $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} : [0,\infty] \to [0,\infty)$ exists for all y except for a ν-measure zero set.

[16] For any ν and $\widetilde{\nu}$ there exist a $\nu_{ac} \prec \widetilde{\nu}$ and a $\nu_s \perp \widetilde{\nu}$ such that $\nu = \nu_{ac} + \nu_s$ by the Lebesgue decomposition theorem [23, 5.5.3]. Since all w's in $\mathcal{X}_p$ are absolutely continuous with respect to both ν and $\widetilde{\nu}$, they are absolutely continuous with respect to ν_{ac}. Using Definition 1 and the Radon-Nikodym theorem [23, 5.5.4] we get

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\nu} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\nu_{ac}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\nu_{ac}} \quad \nu-a.e \qquad \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\widetilde{\nu}} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\nu_{ac}}{\mathrm{d}\widetilde{\nu}}\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\nu_{ac}} \quad \widetilde{\nu}-a.e$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\nu_{ac}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}{\mathrm{d}\nu_{ac}} \quad \nu-a.e \qquad \frac{\mathrm{d}\widetilde{\mu_{\alpha,p}}}{\mathrm{d}\widetilde{\nu}} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\nu_{ac}}{\mathrm{d}\widetilde{\nu}}\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}{\mathrm{d}\nu_{ac}} \quad \widetilde{\nu}-a.e \quad \text{where} \quad \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}{\mathrm{d}\nu_{ac}} \triangleq \left[\sum\nolimits_{w:p(w)>0} p(w)\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\nu_{ac}}\right)^\alpha\right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}.$$

Then $\mu_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{E}) = \widetilde{\mu_{\alpha,p}}(\mathcal{E}) = \int_{\mathcal{E}} \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}{\mathrm{d}\nu_{ac}}\nu_{ac}(\mathrm{d}y)$.

In [5, Section 26], Augustin introduced the weighted power means of probability measures and derived some of the observations reported in Lemmas 1, 2, 3 and 4, albeit for different parameterizations of the order. Augustin, however, did not discuss the relation between Renyi information quantities and the power means of the probability measures. Proofs of Lemmas 1, 2, 3 and 4 are presented in Appendix A.

Lemma 1. *Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space and p be a p.m.f. on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$.*
(a) $|\mathcal{X}_p|^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \leq \|\mu_{\alpha,p}\| \leq |\mathcal{X}_p|$ *and* $\mu_{\alpha,p} \sim \mu_{1,p}$ *for any* $\alpha \in (0,\infty]$. *Furthermore,* $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\| = 1$.
(b) $\mu_{0,p} \prec w$ *for any* $w \in \mathcal{X}_p$ *and* $\|\mu_{0,p}\| \leq 1$.

Since for any fixed prior p the weighted mean measures of different positive orders are all equivalent to one another; we can describe and analyze them in terms of their Radon-Nikodym derivative with respect to the order one mean measure.

Definition 2. Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space and p be a p.m.f. on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$. Then the order α density for the prior p is

$$\pi_{\alpha,p} \triangleq \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p}}. \tag{3}$$

For any p.m.f. p on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, the order α density for the prior p is a $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$-measurable function from $\mathcal{Y}$ to $\mathbb{R}$ by the Radon-Nikodym theorem [23, 5.5.4].

Definition 3. Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space, p be a p.m.f. on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, and α be a positive real number. Then for each $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ *the order α posteiror* $p_{[\alpha]}$ is a p.m.f. on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ given by

$$p_{[\alpha]}(w|y) \triangleq \begin{cases} p(w)\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}\right)^{\alpha} & w \in \mathcal{X}_p \\ p(w) & \text{else} \end{cases}. \tag{4}$$

The order α posterior p.m.f. $p_{[\alpha]}$ is a $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$-measurable function for each w. The order one posterior p.m.f. $p_{[1]}$ is also called the posterior p.m.f., in accordance with the usual terminology.

Lemma 2. *Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space and p be a p.m.f. on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$. Then for $\mu_{1,p}$-almost everywhere:*
(a)

$$\pi_{\alpha,p}(y) = \begin{cases} \prod_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p}\left(\frac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)}\right)^{p(w)} & \alpha = 0 \\ \left(\sum_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} p_{[1]}(w|y)^{\alpha}p(w)^{1-\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} & \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+ \\ \bigvee_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p}\frac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)} & \alpha = \infty \end{cases}. \tag{5}$$

$$p_{[\alpha]}(w|y) = \begin{cases} \frac{p_{[1]}(w|y)^{\alpha}p(w)^{1-\alpha}}{{\pi_{\alpha,p}}^{\alpha}} & p(w) > 0 \\ p(w) & \textit{else} \end{cases}. \tag{6}$$

(b) $\pi_{\alpha,p}$ is a smooth function of the order α on $(0,\infty)$. Furthermore, the first two derivatives of $\pi_{\alpha,p}$ are given by

$$\pi'_{\alpha,p} \triangleq \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}\pi_{\alpha,p} = \frac{\pi_{\alpha,p}}{\alpha^2}\sum\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} p_{[\alpha]}(w|y)\ln\frac{p_{[\alpha]}(w|y)}{p(w)}. \tag{7}$$

$$\pi''_{\alpha,p} \triangleq \frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}\alpha^2}\pi_{\alpha,p} = \frac{(\pi'_{\alpha,p})^2}{\pi_{\alpha,p}} - \frac{2\pi'_{\alpha,p}}{\alpha} + \frac{\pi_{\alpha,p}}{\alpha^3}\sum\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} p_{[\alpha]}(w|y)\left(\ln\frac{p_{[\alpha]}(w|y)}{p(w)} - \frac{\alpha^2\pi'_{\alpha,p}}{\pi_{\alpha,p}}\right)^2. \tag{8}$$

(c) $(\pi_{\alpha,p})^{\alpha}$ is log-convex[17] *in α on $(0,\infty)$, i.e. for any $\beta \in (0,1)$ and $\alpha_0,\alpha_1 \in (0,\infty)$*

$$(\pi_{\alpha_\beta,p})^{\alpha_\beta} \leq (\pi_{\alpha_1,p})^{\beta\alpha_1}(\pi_{\alpha_0,p})^{(1-\beta)\alpha_0} \qquad \textit{where } \alpha_\beta = \beta\alpha_1 + (1-\beta)\alpha_0. \tag{9}$$

Furthermore, for $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_0$ the inequality is strict iff there exist $w,\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{X}_p$ such that $\frac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)} > \frac{p(\tilde{w}|y)}{p(\tilde{w})} > 0$.
(d) If $\exists w$ such that $p_{[1]}(w|y) > p(w)$ then $\pi_{\alpha,p}(y)$ is strictly increasing and continuous in α on $[0,\infty]$, else $\pi_{\alpha,p}(y) = 1$ $\forall\alpha \in [0,\infty]$.

Note that $\pi'_{\alpha,p}$ and $\pi''_{\alpha,p}$ given in equations (7) and (8) are measurable functions because $\pi_{\alpha,p}$ and $p_{[\alpha]}$ are measurable. Then using their integrals we can define two mappings:

$$\mu'_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{E}) \triangleq \int_{\mathcal{E}} (\pi'_{\alpha,p})\mu_{1,p}(\mathrm{d}y) \qquad \forall\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{Y} \tag{10}$$

$$\mu''_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{E}) \triangleq \int_{\mathcal{E}} (\pi''_{\alpha,p})\mu_{1,p}(\mathrm{d}y) \qquad \forall\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{Y}. \tag{11}$$

[17]Both of the following statements are equivalent to the log-convexity of $(\pi_{\alpha,p})^{\alpha}$ in α: "$\pi_{\frac{1}{1+\rho},p}$ is logconvex in ρ" and "For any $\beta \in [0,1]$ and $\alpha_0,\alpha_1 \in (0,\infty]$, $\pi_{\alpha_\beta,p} \leq (\pi_{\alpha_0,p})^{1-\beta}(\pi_{\alpha_1,p})^{\beta}$ where α_β is $\alpha_\beta = [(1-\beta)(\alpha_0)^{-1} + \beta(\alpha_1)^{-1}]^{-1}$."

We have not claimed that either of these mappings is defining a measure for each α; we have not even claimed that either of the integrals exist for all $\mathcal{E}$ in $\mathcal{Y}$. Those claims and more are established in part (b) and (c) of Lemma 3 in the following. Lemma 2 establishes the continuity and the differentiability of the density $\pi_{\alpha,p}$ as a function of order α; Lemma 3 does the same for the mean measure $\mu_{\alpha,p}$.

Lemma 3. *Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space and p be a p.m.f. on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$.*
(a) $\mu_{\alpha,p}:[0,\infty]\to\mathcal{M}_0^+(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ is continuous if $[0,\infty]$ has its usual topology and $\mathcal{M}_0^+(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ has the total variation topology.
(b) $\mu'_{\alpha,p}:(0,\infty)\to\mathcal{M}_0^+(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ is continuous if $(0,\infty)$ has its usual topology and $\mathcal{M}_0^+(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ has the total variation topology. Furthermore, $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}\mu_{\alpha,p}=\mu'_{\alpha,p}$ in the sense that

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}\mu_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{E})\big|_{\alpha=\phi}=\mu'_{\phi,p}(\mathcal{E})\qquad\qquad\forall\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{Y},\quad\forall\phi\in(0,\infty).\tag{12}$$

(c) $\mu''_{\alpha,p}:(0,\infty)\to\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ is continuous if $(0,\infty)$ has its usual topology and $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ has the total variation topology. Furthermore, $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}\mu'_{\alpha,p}=\mu''_{\alpha,p}$ in the sense that

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}\mu'_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{E})\big|_{\alpha=\phi}=\mu''_{\phi,p}(\mathcal{E})\qquad\qquad\forall\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{Y},\quad\forall\phi\in(0,\infty).\tag{13}$$

(d) $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|^\alpha$ is a log-convex function of α on $(0,\infty)$ such that

$$\lim_{\alpha\to0}\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|^\alpha=ess\sup_{\mu_{1,p}}\sum\nolimits_{w:p_{[1]}(w|y)>0}p(w).\tag{14}$$

Log-convex convexity of $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|^\alpha$ is strict everywhere on $(0,\infty)$, unless there exists a $\gamma\geq1$ such that $\mu_{1,p}(\mathcal{A}(p,\gamma))=1$ where $\mathcal{A}(p,\gamma)=\{y:\frac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)}=\gamma,\ \forall w:p_{[1]}(w|y)>0\}$. If there exists such a γ then $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|=\gamma^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}$.
(e) $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|:[0,\infty]\to[0,|\mathcal{X}_p|]$ is continuous and increasing in α. If there exist $w,\widetilde{w}\in\mathcal{X}_p$ such that $w\neq\widetilde{w}$ then $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|$ is strictly increasing everywhere on $(0,\infty)$, else $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|=1$ for all $\alpha\in[0,\infty]$.

In Lemmas 1, 2 and 3, we described the properties of the mean measure as a function of the order for a fixed prior. In Lemma 4, we describe the properties of the mean measure as a function of the prior for a fixed order.

Lemma 4. *Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space.*
(a) If $\alpha\in[0,1]$ then $\mu_{\alpha,p}:\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}))\to\mathcal{M}_0^+(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ and $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|:\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}))\to[0,1]$ are convex in p.
(b) If $\alpha\in[1,\infty]$ then $\mu_{\alpha,p}:\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}))\to\mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ and $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|:\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}))\to[1,\infty)$ are concave in p.
(c) For any $p_1,p_2\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}))$ such that $p_1\neq p_2$, let $s_\wedge$, s_1 and s_2 be $s_\wedge\triangleq2\frac{p_1\wedge p_2}{2-\|p_1-p_2\|}$, $s_1\triangleq2\frac{p_1-p_1\wedge p_2}{\|p_1-p_2\|}$, and $s_2\triangleq2\frac{p_2-p_1\wedge p_2}{\|p_1-p_2\|}$. Then $s_\wedge,s_1,s_2\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}))$ and

$$p_1=(1-\tfrac{\|p_1-p_2\|}{2})s_\wedge+\tfrac{\|p_1-p_2\|}{2}s_1\qquad p_2=(1-\tfrac{\|p_1-p_2\|}{2})s_\wedge+\tfrac{\|p_1-p_2\|}{2}s_2\qquad s_1\perp s_2.\tag{15}$$

(d) If $\alpha\in(0,1]$ then $\mu_{\alpha,p}:\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}))\to\mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ is Lipschitz continuous for the total variation topology. In particular,

$$\|\mu_{\alpha,p_1}-\mu_{\alpha,p_2}\|\leq\tfrac{1+\alpha}{2\alpha}\|p_1-p_2\|\qquad\qquad\forall\alpha\in(0,1],\ p_1,p_2\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})).\tag{16}$$

(e) If $\alpha\in[1,\infty]$ then for any $p_1,p_2\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}))$ we have

$$\|\mu_{\alpha,p_1}-\mu_{\alpha,p_2}\|\leq\left(\tfrac{\|p_1-p_2\|}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}(\|\mu_{\alpha,s_1}-\mu_{\alpha,s_2}\|).\tag{17}$$

B. The Renyi Information

Definition 4. Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space, $\mathcal{W}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ and p be a p.m.f. on $\mathcal{W}$. Then *the order α Renyi information for the prior p* is

$$I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})\triangleq\begin{cases}-\ln ess\sup\limits_{\mu_{1,p}}\left(\sum_{w:p_{[1]}(w|y)>0}p(w)\right) & \alpha=0\\ \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\ln\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\| & \alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\}\\ \int\left[\sum_w p_{[1]}(w|y)\ln\frac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)}\right]\mu_{1,p}(\mathrm{d}y) & \alpha=1\\ \ln\|\mu_{\infty,p}\| & \alpha=\infty\end{cases}.\tag{18}$$

Sibson introduced this quantity[18] in [66] using works of Renyi [57] and Csiszar [15], [16].

[18]Sibson defines "the information radius of order α" as the infimum of certain order α Renyi divergence and proves it to be equal to the expression given in Definition 4 in [66, Theorem 2.2]. Our presentation is different: Definition 4 does not refer to any infimum; equivalence of the alternative definition is established in Lemma 10. This is similar to the way things are, usually, handled for the mutual information: the mutual information is defined without any reference to an infimum [13, Equation 2.35], later it is shown to be equal to the infimum of certain Kullback-Leibler divergence [13, Lemma 10.8.1].

Gallager introduced $E_0(\rho,p)$ in [28] prior to Sibson [66].

$$E_0(\rho,p)\triangleq-\ln\int\left(\sum\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{W}}p(w)\left(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{\frac{1}{1+\rho}}\right)^{1+\rho}\nu(\mathrm{d}y)\qquad\qquad\forall\rho\in(-1,\infty).$$

The Gallager's function is nothing but a scaled version of the Renyi information: $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})=\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}E_0(\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha},p)$ equivalently $E_0(\rho,p)=\rho I_{\frac{1}{1+\rho}}(p;\mathcal{W})$.

Notation we use for $\mu_{\alpha,p}$ does not refer to a set $\mathcal{W}$ for which $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ because $\mu_{\alpha,p}$ is the same for all such sets. Likewise, $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ has the same value for all $\mathcal{W}$'s for which $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$. Hence one can use $I_\alpha(p)$ rather than $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$. We refrain from doing so, for the fear of alienating some readers. Another justification for using the conventional notation is the effect of the richness of $\mathcal{W}$ — as measured by $\sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$— on the continuity of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ as a function of p, see Lemma 12-(d).

Properties of the Renyi information as a function of the order for fixed prior and as a function of the prior for fixed order are presented in Lemmas 5 and 6, respectively. Proofs of Lemmas 5 and 6 are presented in Appendix B.

Lemma 5. *Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space, $\mathcal{W}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ and p be a p.m.f. on $\mathcal{W}$. Then $0 \le I_0(p;\mathcal{W}) \le I_\infty(p;\mathcal{W}) \le \ln|\mathcal{X}_p|$ and $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) : \mathbb{R}^+ \to [I_0(p;\mathcal{W}), I_\infty(p;\mathcal{W})]$ is a continuously differentiable increasing function such that*

$$\lim_{\alpha\downarrow 0} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) = I_0(p;\mathcal{W}) \tag{19}$$

$$\lim_{\alpha\uparrow\infty} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) = I_\infty(p;\mathcal{W}) \tag{20}$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\frac{\|\mu'_{\alpha,p}\|}{\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|} + \frac{1}{(\alpha-1)^2}\ln\frac{1}{\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|} & \alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\} \\ \frac{\mu''_{1,p}(\mathcal{Y})+2\|\mu'_{1,p}\|-\|\mu'_{1,p}\|^2}{2} & \alpha=1 \end{cases}. \tag{21}$$

If $\exists$ a $\gamma \ge 1$ and a set $\mathcal{A}(p,\gamma) = \{y : \frac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)} = \gamma,\ \forall w : p_{[1]}(w|y) > 0\}$ such that $\mu_{1,p}(\mathcal{A}(p,\gamma)) = 1$ then $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) = \ln\gamma$ for all $\alpha\in[0,\infty]$, else $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) > 0$ for all $\alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+$.

Using the expressions for $\pi'_{\alpha,p}$ and $\pi''_{\alpha,p}$ given in equations (7) and (8) we get the following expressions for the derivative of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ with respect to the order α.

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{(\alpha-1)\alpha}\left[\int\sum_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p}\frac{p_{[\alpha]}(w|y)}{\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|}\ln\frac{p_{[\alpha]}(w|y)}{p(w)}\mu_{\alpha,p}(\mathrm{d}y) - I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})\right] & \alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\} \\ \int\sum_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} p_{[1]}(w|y)\left[\ln\frac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)} - I_1(p;\mathcal{W})\right]^2\mu_{1,p}(\mathrm{d}y) & \alpha=1 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{(\alpha-1)^2}\int\sum_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p}\frac{p_{[\alpha]}(w|y)}{\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|}\ln\frac{p_{[\alpha]}(w|y)\pi_{\alpha,p}}{p_{[1]}(w|y)\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|}\mu_{\alpha,p}(\mathrm{d}y) & \alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\} \\ \int\sum_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} p_{[1]}(w|y)\left[\ln\frac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)} - I_1(p;\mathcal{W})\right]^2\mu_{1,p}(\mathrm{d}y) & \alpha=1 \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

The continuity and the convexity properties of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ as a function of p follows from the corresponding properties of $\mu_{\alpha,p}$ described in Lemma 4.

Lemma 6. *Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space and $\mathcal{W}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$.*
(a) If $\alpha\in[0,1)$ then $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}) \to [0,\infty)$ is continuous[19] and quasi-concave in p.
(b) If $\alpha\in[1,\infty]$ then $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}) \to [0,\infty)$ is concave in p.

Results on the continuity of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ in p can be traced back to the works of Gallager [28, p.18] and Csiszar [17, Lemma 3.2]. As it is customary, both authors considered $\mathcal{W}$'s with finite number of elements and proved results implying the continuity of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ as a function of p. For arbitrary $\mathcal{W}$'s, $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ is continuous only for orders in $(0,1)$. For orders in $[1,\infty)$ there are $\mathcal{W}$'s for which $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ is not continuous in p, see Lemma 12- (b,d).

C. The Renyi Divergence

Definition 5. Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space, μ and q be non-zero finite measures on $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, and α be an order in $[0,\infty]$. Then *the order α Renyi divergence between μ and q* is

$$D_\alpha^{\mathcal{Y}}(\mu\|\, q) \triangleq \sup_{\mathcal{E}} D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q) \tag{22}$$

where the supremum is over all $\mathcal{Y}$ measurable finite partitions of $\mathcal{Y}$ and $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$ is given by

$$D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q) \triangleq \begin{cases} -\ln\sum_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\mu(\mathcal{E})>0\}}q(\mathcal{E}) & \alpha=0 \\ \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\ln\sum_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}}(\mu(\mathcal{E}))^\alpha(q(\mathcal{E}))^{1-\alpha} & \alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\} \\ \sum_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}}\mu(\mathcal{E})\ln\frac{\mu(\mathcal{E})}{q(\mathcal{E})} & \alpha=1 \\ \bigvee_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}}\ln\frac{\mu(\mathcal{E})}{q(\mathcal{E})} & \alpha=\infty \end{cases}. \tag{23}$$

We drop the superscript $\mathcal{Y}$ and use $D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q)$ rather than $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{Y}}(\mu\|\, q)$ whenever the σ-algebra, on which μ and q are defined, is unambiguous.

The Renyi divergences [24], [57] are usually defined for probability measures; the inclusion of finite measures allows us to express relations about mean measures in a succinct way. The drawback is that certain properties, such as non-negativity, don't hold for this more general definition. A rigorous and near exhaustive analysis of Renyi divergences, for the usual case

[19]We assume $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$has the total variation topology and $[0,\infty)$ has its usual topology.

when μ and q are probability measures, has recently been published by Erven and Harremoes [24]. We state the properties we need in Lemmas 7, 8 and 9. Their proofs are presented in Appendix C, for completeness.

The order α Renyi divergence can be positive infinity, but it is never equal to negative infinity: If $\mu \perp q$ then $D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q) = \infty$ for all α; on the other hand, by considering the partition that has just one element, i.e. $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathcal{Y}\}$, we get

$$D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q) \geq \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \ln \|\mu\| - \ln \|q\| & \alpha \neq 1 \\ \|\mu\| \ln \|\mu\| - \ln \|q\| & \alpha = 1 \end{cases}. \tag{24}$$

Another important immediate consequence of the definition of the order α Renyi divergence is the lower semicontinuity.

Lemma 7. *Let $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ be measurable space and α be an order in $(0, \infty]$. Then $D_\alpha(\cdot\|\,\cdot) : \mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}) \times \mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}) \to (-\infty, \infty]$ is a lower semicontinuous function for the product topology on $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}) \times \mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ provided that the topology on each $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ is the topology of setwise convergence.*

The natural generalization of the usual definition of Renyi divergence in terms of integrals, is equivalent to Definition 5. Furthermore the supremum in Definition 5 can be restricted to the finite partitions that are measurable in the minimum σ-algebra of the non-negative extended real valued function $(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}/\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu})$ for any reference measure ν for μ and q.

Lemma 8. *Let $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space, μ and q be non-zero finite measures on $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$, and ν be a reference measure for μ and q. Then*

$$D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q) = \begin{cases} -\ln q\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu} > 0\right) & \alpha = 0 \\ \frac{1}{\alpha-1} \ln \int \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^\alpha \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{1-\alpha} \nu(\mathrm{d}y) & \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{1\} \\ \int \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu} \left[\ln \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu} - \ln \frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right] \nu(\mathrm{d}y) & \alpha = 1 \\ \ln ess \sup_\nu (\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}/\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}) & \alpha = \infty \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

Furthermore, there exists a nested sequence of finite partitions $\{\mathcal{E}^{(\imath)}\}$ such that

$$D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q) = \lim_{\imath \to \infty} D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}^{(\imath)}}(\mu\|\, q) \qquad \forall \alpha \in [0, \infty] \tag{26}$$

where $\mathcal{E}^{(\imath)}$'s are measurable in the minimum σ-algebra of the non-negative extended real valued function $(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}/\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu})$.

Lemma 9. *Let $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space and μ, q, s be non-zero finite measures on $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$.*

(a) If $\|\mu\| = 1$ then $D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q)$ is an increasing lower semicontinuous function of α on $[0, \infty]$, which is continuous on $[0, \chi_{\mu,q}]$ where $\chi_{\mu,q} = 1 \vee \sup\{z : D_z(\mu\|\, q) < \infty\}$.

(b) $\forall \alpha \in [0, \infty]$,
- *If $s \ll q$ then $D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q) \leq D_\alpha(\mu\|\, s)$*
- *If $q = \gamma s$ for a $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^+$ then $D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q) = D_\alpha(\mu\|\, s) - \ln \gamma$.*

(c) $\forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{1\}$,
- *If $s \ll \mu$ then $(1-\alpha) D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q) \leq (1-\alpha) D_\alpha(s\|\, q)$*
- *If $\mu = \gamma s$ for a $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^+$ then $(1-\alpha) D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q) = (1-\alpha) D_\alpha(s\|\, q) - \alpha \ln \gamma$.*

(d) $\forall \alpha \in [0, \infty]$, the order α Renyi divergence is convex in its second argument:

$$D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q_\beta) \leq \beta D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q_1) + (1-\beta) D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q_0) \qquad \text{where} \qquad q_\beta = \beta q_1 + (1-\beta) q_0. \tag{27}$$

(e) $\forall \alpha \in [0, \infty]$, the order α Renyi divergence is jointly quasi-convex in its arguments:[20]

$$D_\alpha(\mu_\beta\|\, q_\beta) \leq D_\alpha(\mu_1\|\, q_1) \vee D_\alpha(\mu_0\|\, q_0) \qquad \text{where } q_\beta = \beta q_1 + (1-\beta) q_0,\ \mu_\beta = \beta \mu_1 + (1-\beta)\mu_0. \tag{28}$$

(f) $\forall \alpha \in [0, \infty]$, let $\mathcal{Y}_1$ and $\mathcal{Y}_2$ be σ-algebras such that $\mathcal{Y}_2 \subset \mathcal{Y}_1 \subset \mathcal{Y}$ then $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{Y}_2}(\mu\|\, q) \leq D_\alpha^{\mathcal{Y}_1}(\mu\|\, q)$.

(g) $\forall \alpha \in (0, \infty]$ and $\|\mu\| = \|q\| = 1$, $0 < D_\alpha^{\mathcal{Y}}(\mu\|\, q)$ unless $\mu = q$.

(h) $\forall \alpha \in (0, \infty]$

$$\|\mu - q\|^2 \leq (\|\mu\| - \|q\|)^2 + 4\|\mu\|\|q\| \left(1 - e^{-(\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} \vee 1) D_\alpha\left(\frac{\mu}{\|\mu\|} \middle\| \frac{q}{\|q\|}\right)}\right) \tag{29}$$

$$\leq (\|\mu\| - \|q\|)^2 + 4\|\mu\|\|q\| (\tfrac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} \vee 1) D_\alpha\left(\frac{\mu}{\|\mu\|} \middle\| \frac{q}{\|q\|}\right). \tag{30}$$

[20] $\forall \alpha \in [0, 1]$, the order α Renyi divergence is jointly convex in its arguments: $D_\alpha(\mu_\beta\|\, q_\beta) \leq \beta D_\alpha(\mu_1\|\, q_1) + (1-\beta) D_\alpha(\mu_0\|\, q_0)$. Proof given in Appendix C for Lemma 9 also establishes this fact while establishing part (e).

For $\alpha = 1$ Csiszar [15] and for $\alpha \in (0,1)$ Augustin[21] [5] and Gilardoni [35] proved the following bound on the order α Renyi divergence in terms of the total variation distance

$$\tfrac{\alpha}{2}\|\mu - q\|^2 \leq D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q) \qquad\qquad \forall \mu, q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}), \alpha \in (0,1]. \tag{31}$$

These bounds are called Pinsker's inequalities. The constant $\frac{\alpha}{2}$ is the best possible: for any $\gamma < \frac{\alpha}{2}$ there are probability measures μ and q such that $\gamma\|\mu - q\|^2 > D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q)$. Note that the inequality in (30) implies the following bound when μ and q are probability measures

$$\tfrac{1}{2((1-\alpha)\vee\alpha)}\tfrac{\alpha}{2}\|\mu - q\|^2 \leq D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q)\,.$$

Thus, the inequality in (30) can be interpreted as a generalized Pinsker's inequality for finite measures, albeit with a suboptimal constant.[22] Similarly, the inequality in (29) can be seen as a Vajda's inequality[23] for finite measures.

D. The Renyi Mean and The Alternative Characterization of The Renyi Information

In the following, we demonstrate that $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ can be characterized in terms of the order α Renyi divergence for all $\alpha \in [0,\infty]$. The normalized measure corresponding to the order α mean measure for prior p, which we call the order α Renyi mean for prior p, plays a key role in this alternative characterization.

Definition 6. Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space and p be a p.m.f. on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$. Then *the order α Renyi mean for prior p* is

$$q_{\alpha,p} \triangleq \begin{cases} \frac{e^{-D_1\left(p_{[0]}\middle\|p_{[1]}\right)}\mathbb{1}_{\{y\in\widetilde{\mathcal{Y}}_p\}}\mu_{1,p}}{\int_{\widetilde{\mathcal{Y}}_p} e^{-D_1\left(p_{[0]}\middle\|p_{[1]}\right)}\mu_{1,p}(\mathrm{d}y)} & \alpha = 0 \\ \frac{\mu_{\alpha,p}}{\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|} & \alpha \in (0,\infty] \end{cases} \tag{32}$$

where $p_{[0]}(w|y) = \frac{p(w)\mathbb{1}_{\{p_{[1]}(w|y)>0\}}}{\sum_{\widetilde{w}} p(\widetilde{w})\mathbb{1}_{\{p(\widetilde{w}|y)>0\}}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{Y}}_p = \left\{ y : \sum_w p(w)\mathbb{1}_{\{p_{[1]}(w|y)>0\}} = \underset{\mu_{1,p}}{ess\sup}\left(\sum_{w:p_{[1]}(w|y)>0} p(w)\right)\right\}$.

The following identity can be verified by substitution using the alternative expression for the order α Renyi divergence given in equation (25) and the definitions of $\mu_{\alpha,p}$ and $q_{\alpha,p}$ given in equations (2) and (32), respectively.

$$D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q) = D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q_{\alpha,p}) + D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,p}\|\, q) \qquad\qquad \forall\alpha\in(0,\infty], \forall q \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}) \tag{33}$$

Furthermore, one can also confirm by substitution that $D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q_{\alpha,p}) = I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ for all positive orders. For positive orders the Renyi divergence is equal to zero iff its arguments are equal to one another by Lemma 9-(g). Thus for any positive order α and prior p, $q_{\alpha,p}$ is the only probability measure q for which $D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q) = I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ holds. For $\alpha = 0$ any probability measure q that is absolutely continuous in the $q_{0,p}$ satisfies $D_0(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q) = I_0(p;\mathcal{W})$. Lemma 10 summarizes these observations.

Lemma 10. *Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space, $\mathcal{W}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, p be a p.m.f. on $\mathcal{W}$, and α be an order in $[0,\infty]$. Then*

$$I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) = D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q_{\alpha,p}) \tag{34}$$

$$= \inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q) \tag{35}$$

$$= \inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} D_\alpha(\mu_{\alpha,p}\|\, q) \qquad\qquad \alpha\in(0,\infty]\setminus\{1\} \tag{36}$$

where $p\circ\mathcal{W}$ is the probability measure on $2^{\mathcal{X}_p}\otimes\mathcal{Y}$ whose marginal distribution on $\mathcal{X}_p$ is p and whose conditional distribution is w.

[21] $\|\mu-q\|^2 \leq \left(\frac{2-\alpha}{3}\|\mu\|+\frac{1+\alpha}{3}\|q\|\right)\frac{2}{\alpha(1-\alpha)}\left(\alpha\|\mu\|+(1-\alpha)\|q\|-e^{(\alpha-1)D_\alpha(\mu\|q)}\right)$ for all $\mu, q\in\mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$,$\alpha\in[-1,2]$ according to [5, Lemma 26.5b]. This implies the inequality given in (31) via the identity $e^{-x}\geq 1-x$.

[22] An alternative Pinsker's inequality for finite measures can be obtained from the inequality in (29) by using the identity $e^{-x}\geq 1-x$ slightly differently:

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mu-q\|^2 &\leq (\|\mu\|+\|q\|)^2\left(1-\tfrac{4\|\mu\|\|q\|}{(\|\mu\|+\|q\|)^2}e^{-(\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\vee 1)D_\alpha\left(\frac{\mu}{\|\mu\|}\middle\|\frac{q}{\|q\|}\right)}\right)\\ &\leq (\|\mu\|+\|q\|)^2\left((\tfrac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\vee 1)D_\alpha\left(\tfrac{\mu}{\|\mu\|}\middle\|\tfrac{q}{\|q\|}\right)+\ln\tfrac{4\|\mu\|\|q\|}{(\|\mu\|+\|q\|)^2}\right).\end{aligned}$$

[23] Kullback [47], [48] improved Pinsker's inequality and proved $D_1(\mu\|\, q)\geq \|\mu-q\|^2/2+\|\mu-q\|^4/36$. Hence, Pinsker's inequality is tight only for $\|\mu-q\|\approx 0$. Vajda [73] established $D_1(\mu\|\, q)\geq \ln(\frac{2+\|\mu-q\|}{2-\|\mu-q\|})-\frac{2\|\mu-q\|}{2+\|\mu-q\|}$. Vajda's inequality is tight not only for $\|\mu-q\|\approx 0$ but also for $\|\mu-q\|\approx 2$. Fedotov, Harremoes and Topsoe [25] determined the tight lower bound on $D_1(\mu\|\, q)$ in terms of $\|\mu-q\|$ in a parametric form. Gilardoni [33], [34] proved an equivalent result for f-divergences for twice differentiable f's. Gilardoni's result imply tight bounds for Renyi divergences, which are recently derived in a more explicit form by Sason [59]. The core observation in the derivation of tight Vajda's inequalities is the sufficiency of the probability measures on binary alphabets. Guntuboyina, Saha and Schiebinger [36] have recently generalized this observation considerably and explained how one can determine tight bounds on an f-divergence when its arguments are constrained in terms of other f-divergences. Recall that the total variation distance is the f-divergence for $f(x)=|x-1|$.

III. The Renyi Capacity

For any finite set $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ and $\alpha \in [0,\infty]$, the order α Renyi information is bounded uniformly over $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ because $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) \leq \ln|\mathcal{X}_p|$ by Lemma 5 and $|\mathcal{X}_p| \leq |\mathcal{W}|$ by hypothesis. When $\mathcal{W}$ is an infinite set such a finite uniform bound might not exist. The order α Renyi capacity is defined as the least upper bound on the order α Renyi information.

Definition 7. Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space and $\mathcal{W}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$. Then for any $\alpha \in [0,\infty]$, *the order α Renyi capacity of $\mathcal{W}$* is

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \triangleq \sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})\,. \tag{37}$$

Unlike $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$, $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is not a quantity that is introduced or discussed by Sibson [66]. In the spirit of his earlier work on f-divergences [17], Csiszar introduces this quantity[24] in [19].

Using the alternative characterization of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ given in equation (35) we get the following expression for $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$.

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = \sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} \inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q)\,. \tag{38}$$

For finite α, $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ does not have a closed form expression. The supremum might not be achieved by any prior, i.e. there are $\mathcal{W}$'s for which $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) < C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for all $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$. When the supremum is achieved, the optimal prior might not be unique, i.e. there are $\mathcal{W}$'s for which $I_\alpha(p_1;\mathcal{W}) = I_\alpha(p_2;\mathcal{W}) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ such that $p_1 \neq p_2$. These subtleties, however, does not constitute a serious impediment for analyzing $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$.

In Section III-A, we analyze the Renyi capacity as a function of the order. In Section III-B, we first determine necessary and sufficient conditions for the finiteness of the Renyi capacity and investigate the implications of the finiteness of the Renyi capacity on the continuity of the power means and the Renyi information. In Section III-C, we define the order α Renyi radius $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ and use max-min inequality to prove $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \leq S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for all $\alpha \in [0,\infty]$.

A. The Renyi Capacity as a Function of The Order

Lemma 11. *Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space and $\mathcal{W}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$.*

(a) $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is an increasing lower semicontinuous function of α on $[0,\infty]$.

(b) $\exists$ a countable subset $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$ of $\mathcal{W}$ such that $C_{\alpha,\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for all $\alpha \in [0,\infty]$.

(c) $\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is a decreasing continuous function of α on $(0,1)$ and $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is a continuous function of α on $(0,1]$.

(d) $(\alpha-1)C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is a convex function of α on $(1,\infty)$.

(e) If $C_{z,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$ for a $z \in (0,1)$ then $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is finite for all $\alpha \in [0,1)$.

(f) If $C_{z,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$ for a $z \in (0,\infty]$ then $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is an increasing continuous function[25] of α on $(0,z]$.

(g) If $C_{z,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$ for a $z \in (0,\infty]$ then $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists$ a finite subset $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$ of $\mathcal{W}$ such that $C_{\alpha,\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}} > C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} - \epsilon$ for all $\alpha \in [\epsilon, z]$.

$I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ is continuous in α for any $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ by Lemma 5, however $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is not necessarily continuous in α. If $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is not continuous on $(0,\infty]$ then it has a very specific shape as a result of Lemma 11: there exists an $x \in [1,\infty)$ such that $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is bounded and continuous on $(0,x]$ and infinite on $(x,\infty]$. In order to see why, first note that if $C_{1/2,\mathcal{W}} = \infty$ then $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = \infty$ for all α by Lemma 11-(a,c) and $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is continuous on $(0,\infty]$. On the other hand, if $C_{\infty,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$ then $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is continuous on $(0,\infty]$ by Lemma 11-(f). Hence, $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ can fail to be continuous on $(0,\infty]$ only when $C_{1/2,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$ and $C_{\infty,\mathcal{W}} = \infty$. Let $\chi_\mathcal{W}$ be the set of all orders α for which $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is finite, i.e.

$$\chi_\mathcal{W} \triangleq \{\alpha \in (0,\infty) : C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} < \infty\}.$$

$\chi_\mathcal{W}$ is either of the form $(0,x)$ for an $x \in [1,\infty]$ or of the form $(0,x]$ for an $x \in [1,\infty)$ because $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is increasing by Lemma 11-(a) and finite on $(0,1)$ by Lemma 11-(e). If $\chi_\mathcal{W} = (0,x)$ for an $x \in [1,\infty]$ then $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is continuous on $(0,x]$ by Lemma 11-(a,f), $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is infinite on $[x,\infty]$ by definition and $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is continuous on $(0,\infty]$ by pasting lemma [53, Theorem 18.3]. Thus unless $\chi_\mathcal{W} = (0,x]$ for an $x \in [1,\infty)$, $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is continuous on $(0,\infty]$. If $\chi_\mathcal{W} = (0,x]$ then $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is bounded and continuous on $(0,x]$ and infinite on $(x,\infty]$. Hence the Renyi capacity has a unique discontinuity on $(0,\infty]$, which is at $\alpha = x$. Example 6 provides a $\mathcal{W}$ for each $x \in [1,\infty)$ such that $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ has its unique discontinuity at $\alpha = x$.

Proof of Lemma 11:

[24]In [28], Gallager introduces a 'capacity' $E_0(\rho,\mathcal{W})$ using the function $E_0(\rho,p)$

$$E_0(\rho,\mathcal{W}) \triangleq \begin{cases} \sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} E_0(\rho,p) & \rho \in (0,\infty) \\ \inf_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} E_0(\rho,p) & \rho \in (-1,0) \end{cases}.$$

Since $E_0(\rho,p)$ and $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ are scaled versions of one another by definition, so are Gallager's capacity and Renyi capacity: $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} E_0(\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha},\mathcal{W})$ equivalently $E_0(\rho,\mathcal{W}) = \frac{1}{\rho} C_{\frac{1}{1+\rho},\mathcal{W}}$.

[25]We are unable to establish the continuity of $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ at $\alpha = 0$ for arbitrary $\mathcal{W}$. For finite $\mathcal{W}$, Sion's minimax theorem implies the continuity of $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ at $\alpha = 0$, see Lemma 12-(f).

(11-a) The pointwise supremum of a family of increasing (lower semicontinuous) functions is increasing (lower semicontinuous). Then $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is increasing and lower semicontinuous in α on $[0,\infty]$ because $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is the pointwise supremum of the family $\{I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})\}_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})}$ and $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ is increasing and continuous in α for each $p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ by Lemma 5.

(11-b) The Renyi capacity is an increasing and lower semicontinuous function of the order by part (a). Then

$$C_{z,\mathcal{W}} = \sup_{\alpha\in(0,z)\cap\mathbb{Q}} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \qquad\qquad \forall z\in(0,\infty].$$

Consequently, $C_{\alpha,\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for all $\alpha\in[0,\infty]$ if $C_{\alpha,\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for all $\alpha\in\mathbb{Q}_0^+$. For each $\alpha\in\mathbb{Q}_0^+$ choose a sequence of p.m.f.'s $\{p^{(\alpha,\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ such that $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\big(p^{(\alpha,\imath)};\mathcal{W}\big) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}$ be $\cup_{\alpha\in\mathbb{Q}_0^+}\cup_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}\mathcal{X}_{p^{(\alpha,\imath)}}$. Then $C_{\alpha,\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for all $\alpha\in\mathbb{Q}_0^+$; hence for all $\alpha\in\mathbb{R}_0^+$.

(11-c) $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|$ is increasing and continuous in α, by Lemma 3-(e). Furthermore, by the definitions of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ and $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ we have

$$\tfrac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = \sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} \ln\tfrac{1}{\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|} \qquad\qquad \forall\alpha\in(0,1).$$

Then $\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is decreasing and lower semicontinuous in α on $(0,1)$ because the pointwise supremum of a family of decreasing (lower semicontinuous) functions is decreasing (lower semicontinuous). Thus $\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ and $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ are both continuous from the right on $(0,1)$. On the other hand $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ and $\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ are both continuous from the left on $(0,1)$ because $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is increasing and lower semicontinuous on $(0,1)$ by part (a). Consequently, $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ and $\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ are both continuous on $(0,1)$. Furthermore, $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is continuous on $(0,1]$, as well, because $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is increasing and lower semicontinuous by part (a).

(11-d) $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|^\alpha$ is log-convex in α by Lemma 3-(d). On the other hand, by the definitions of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ and $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ we have

$$(\alpha-1)C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = \sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} \alpha\ln\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\| \qquad\qquad \forall\alpha\in(1,\infty).$$

Then $(\alpha-1)C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is convex in α because the pointwise supremum of a family of convex functions is convex.

(11-e) $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is increasing in α by part (a). Thus, if $C_{z,\mathcal{W}}<\infty$ then $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}<\infty$ for all $\alpha\in[0,z]$. On the other hand, $\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is decreasing in α on $(0,1)$ by part (c). Thus if $C_{z,\mathcal{W}}<\infty$ then $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}<\infty$ for all $\alpha\in[z,1)$.

(11-f) $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is continuous in α on $(0,1]$ by part (c). Thus we only need to prove the claim for the case when $z>1$ on $[1,z]$. We prove the continuity of $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ in α first on $(1,z]$ and then from the right at $\alpha=1$.
If $C_{z,\mathcal{W}}$ is finite for a z in $(1,\infty)$ then $(\alpha-1)C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is finite and convex in α on $[1,z]$ by parts (a) and (d). Then $(\alpha-1)C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is continuous in α on $(1,z)$ by [23, Theorem 6.3.3]. The continuity of $(\alpha-1)C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ on $(1,z)$ implies the continuity of $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ on $(1,z)$. Furthermore, $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is continuous from the left because $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is increasing and lower semicontinuous. Hence, $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is continuous in α on $(1,z]$.
If $C_{\infty,\mathcal{W}}$ is finite then $C_{z,\mathcal{W}}$ is finite for all $z\in(0,\infty)$ by part (a) and $C_{z,\mathcal{W}}$ is continuous on $(0,\infty)$ because the continuity of a function on a collection of open set implies its continuity on their union, [53, Theorem 18.2]. This implies the continuity of $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ on $(0,\infty]$ because $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is increasing and lower semicontinuous by part (a).
For proving the continuity of $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ from the right at $\alpha=1$, we first prove that $\{I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})\}_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})}$ is equicontinuous from the right at $\alpha=1$. Using the definitions of $\mu'_{\alpha,p}$ and $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ given in (10) and (18) together with Lemma 2-(b) we get

$$I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) - I_1(p;\mathcal{W}) = \tfrac{\alpha\ln\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\| - (\alpha-1)\|\mu'_{1,p}\|}{\alpha-1} \qquad\qquad \forall\alpha\in(1,z],\ \forall p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}).$$

The expression in the numerator is differentiable in α because $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|$ is differentiable by Lemma 3-(b). Furthermore, $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\| = \|\mu'_{\alpha,p}\|$ by Lemma 3-(b) and the numerator is zero at $\alpha=1$. Then by the mean value theorem [58, 5.10], there exists a $\phi\in[1,\alpha]$ such that

$$I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) - I_1(p;\mathcal{W}) = \ln\|\mu_{\phi,p}\| + \phi\tfrac{\|\mu'_{\phi,p}\|}{\|\mu_{\phi,p}\|} - \|\mu'_{1,p}\|.$$

The expression on the right hand side is differentiable in ϕ because $\|\mu_{\phi,p}\|$ and $\left\|\mu'_{\phi,p}\right\|$ are by Lemma 3-(b,c) and $\|\mu_{\phi,p}\|>0$ by Lemma 1-(a). Furthermore, the expression on the right hand side is zero for $\phi=1$. Thus, using the mean value theorem [58, 5.10] once again we can conclude that there exists an $\eta\in(1,\phi)$ such that

$$I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) - I_1(p;\mathcal{W}) = (\eta-1)\left[2\tfrac{\|\mu'_{\eta,p}\|}{\|\mu_{\eta,p}\|} - \eta\tfrac{\|\mu'_{\eta,p}\|^2}{\|\mu_{\eta,p}\|^2} + \eta\tfrac{\mu''_{\eta,p}(\mathcal{Y})}{\|\mu_{\eta,p}\|}\right].$$

Using Lemma 2-(b) and the identity $\frac{p_{[\alpha]}}{p} = (\frac{p_{[1]}}{p\pi_{\alpha,p}})^\alpha$ we get,

$$\begin{aligned} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) - I_1(p;\mathcal{W}) &= (\eta-1)\int\left[\tfrac{\eta(1-\eta)(\pi'_{\eta,p})^2}{\pi_{\eta,p}\|\mu_{\eta,p}\|} - \eta\tfrac{\|\mu'_{\eta,p}\|^2}{\|\mu_{\eta,p}\|^2} + \sum\nolimits_w \tfrac{\pi_{\eta,p}p(w)}{\|\mu_{\eta,p}\|}\left(\tfrac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)\pi_{\eta,p}}\right)^\eta \ln^2\tfrac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)\pi_{\eta,p}}\right]\mu_{1,p}(\mathrm{d}y) \\ &\le (\alpha-1)\int\tfrac{\pi_{\eta,p}}{\|\mu_{\eta,p}\|}\left[\sum\nolimits_w p(w)\left(\tfrac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)\pi_{\eta,p}}\right)^\eta \ln^2\tfrac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)\pi_{\eta,p}}\right]\mu_{1,p}(\mathrm{d}y). \end{aligned}$$

If $x \geq 1$ then $\ln^2 x \leq (\frac{2}{\epsilon e})^2 x^\epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. Furthermore, if $x \in [0,1]$ then $x^\eta \ln^2 x \leq (\frac{2}{\eta e})^2$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) - I_1(p;\mathcal{W}) &\leq (\alpha-1)\int \tfrac{\pi_{\eta,p}}{\|\mu_{\eta,p}\|}\left[(\tfrac{2}{\eta e})^2 + (\tfrac{2}{\epsilon e})^2\left(\tfrac{\pi_{\eta+\epsilon,p}}{\pi_{\eta,p}}\right)^{\eta+\epsilon}\right]\mu_{1,p}(\mathrm{d}y) \\ &= (\alpha-1)\left[(\tfrac{2}{\eta e})^2 + (\tfrac{2}{\epsilon e})^2\int \tfrac{(\pi_{\eta+\epsilon,p})^{\eta+\epsilon}(\pi_{\eta,p})^{1-\eta-\epsilon}}{\|\mu_{\eta,p}\|}\mu_{1,p}(\mathrm{d}y)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since ${\pi_{\alpha,p}}^\alpha$ is log convex in α by Lemma 3-(d), $(\pi_{\eta+\epsilon,p})^{\eta+\epsilon} \leq (\pi_{\eta,p})^{\eta+\epsilon-1}\pi_{\frac{\eta}{1-\epsilon},p}$ for any $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ and $\eta > 1$. Then using the fact that $\|\mu_{\eta,p}\| \geq \|\mu_{1,p}\| = 1$ we get

$$I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) - I_1(p;\mathcal{W}) \leq (\alpha-1)\left[(\tfrac{2}{\eta e})^2 + (\tfrac{2}{\epsilon e})^2\left\|\mu_{\frac{\eta}{1-\epsilon},p}\right\|\right] \quad \leq \tfrac{8(\alpha-1)e^{-2}}{\epsilon^2}\left\|\mu_{\frac{\alpha}{1-\epsilon},p}\right\| \quad = \tfrac{8(\alpha-1)e^{-2}}{\epsilon^2}e^{\frac{\alpha-1+\epsilon}{\alpha}I_{\frac{\alpha}{1-\epsilon}}(p;\mathcal{W})}.$$

Then for any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{z-1}{z})$

$$I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) - I_1(p;\mathcal{W}) \leq \tfrac{8(\alpha-1)e^{(1+\epsilon)C_{z,\mathcal{W}}}}{e^2\epsilon^2} \qquad \forall \alpha \in [1,(1-\epsilon)z].$$

Then for any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{z-1}{z})$ and $\alpha \in [1,(1-\epsilon)z]$ we have

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \leq \sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} I_1(p;\mathcal{W}) + \tfrac{(\alpha-1)8e^{2C_{z,\mathcal{W}}}}{e^2\epsilon^2} \qquad \leq C_{1,\mathcal{W}} + \tfrac{(\alpha-1)8e^{2C_{z,\mathcal{W}}}}{e^2\epsilon^2}.$$

Hence, $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is continuous from the right at $\alpha = 1$ if $C_{z,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$ for a $z > 1$.

(11-g) Let us first consider $z \in (0,\infty)$ case and construct a sequence $\{\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ of finite subset of $\mathcal{W}$, such that $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \uparrow C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for all $\alpha \in (0,z)$. Choose a $p^{(\imath,\jmath)} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ such that $I_{\jmath 2^{-\imath}}\big(p^{(\imath,\jmath)};\mathcal{W}\big) \geq C_{\jmath 2^{-\imath},\mathcal{W}} - 2^{-\imath}$ for each $\imath \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and non-negative integer $\jmath$ not exceeding $2^\imath z$. Let $\mathcal{W}^{(0)}$ be the empty set and $\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}$ be $\mathcal{W}^{(\imath-1)} \cup_{\jmath=0}^{\lfloor 2^\imath z\rfloor} \mathcal{X}_{p^{(\imath,\jmath)}}$ for each $\imath \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \geq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath-1)}} && \forall \alpha \in [0,\infty] \text{ and } \forall \imath \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \\ &C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \geq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} - 2^{-\imath} && \forall \alpha \in \{\tfrac{0}{2^\imath}, \tfrac{1}{2^\imath}, \ldots, \tfrac{\lfloor z2^\imath\rfloor}{2^\imath}\} \text{ and } \forall \imath \in \mathbb{Z}^+. \end{aligned}$$

Then $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \uparrow C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for all dyadic rational numbers α less than z. Therefore $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \uparrow C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for all $\alpha \in [0,z]$ because the Renyi capacity is increasing and lower semicontinuous. Note that $C_{z,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \leq C_{z,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$. Thus $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}$'s and $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ are continuous on $(0,z]$ by part (f). Then as a result of Dini's theorem [23, 2.4.10], $\{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ converges to $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ uniformly on $[\epsilon,z]$, i.e. for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\imath$ such that $\sup_{\alpha\in[\epsilon,z]}\left|C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} - C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\jmath)}}\right| < \varepsilon$ for all $\jmath > \imath$.
For $z = \infty$ case, let $\kappa_\imath$ be the smallest integer satisfying $C_{\infty,\mathcal{W}} \leq C_{\kappa_\imath 2^{-\imath},\mathcal{W}} + 2^{-\imath}$ for each $\imath \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. We employ the construction described above for $\jmath$'s not exceeding $\kappa_\imath$ rather than $\jmath$'s not exceeding $\lfloor 2^\imath z\rfloor$.

■

B. Finiteness of The Renyi Capacity

If $\mathcal{W}$ is a finite set then $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ is compact for the total variation topology and various results relying on the compactness can be invoked while studying $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ as a function of α or p. For example, if $\mathcal{W}$ is a finite set then we can use the compactness of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ and Sion's minimax theorem to derive the continuity of $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ as a function of α on $[0,\infty]$, see Lemma 12-(f). However, if $\mathcal{W}$ is not a finite set then $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ is not compact. Finiteness of $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ emerges as a very shrewd substitute for the compactness of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ that allows us to assert the continuity of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$.

Lemma 12. *Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space and $\mathcal{W}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$.*

(a) For $\alpha \in (0,1)$, $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = \infty$ iff $\exists$ a sequence $\{p^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ such that $\lim_{\imath\to\infty}\left\|\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\right\| = 0$.

(b) For $\alpha \in (1,\infty]$, $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = \infty$ iff $\exists$ a sequence $\{p^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ such that $\lim_{\imath\to\infty}\left\|\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\right\| = \infty$.

(c) For $\alpha \in (1,\infty)$, $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$ iff $\mu_{\alpha,p}$ is uniformly continuous[26] in p for the total variation topology on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ and $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$.

(d) If $C_{z,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$ then $\{I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})\}_{\alpha\in[0,z]}$ is uniformly equicontinuous,[27] in p on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$. In particular for $\delta = \frac{\|p_1-p_2\|}{2}$ we have

$$\sup_{\alpha\in[0,z]}|I_\alpha(p_2;\mathcal{W}) - I_\alpha(p_1;\mathcal{W})| \leq \begin{cases} (\ln\frac{1}{1-\delta} \wedge \ln\frac{1}{\delta e^{-C_{0,\mathcal{W}}}}) + \ln\left(1-\delta+\delta e^{C_{0,\mathcal{W}}}\right) & z = 0 \\ \frac{z}{z-1}\ln\left[(1-\delta)^{\frac{1}{z}} + \delta^{\frac{1}{z}}e^{\frac{z-1}{z}C_{z,\mathcal{W}}}\right] + \ln\left[1-\delta+\delta e^{C_{z,\mathcal{W}}}\right] & z \in \mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\} \\ \delta C_{1,\mathcal{W}} - \delta\ln\delta - (1-\delta)\ln(1-\delta) + \ln\left[1-\delta+\delta e^{C_{1,\mathcal{W}}}\right] & z = 1 \end{cases}. \tag{39}$$

[26]For $\alpha \in (0,1]$, $\mu_{\alpha,p}$ is uniformly continuous in p, even when $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = \infty$, because $\mu_{\alpha,p}$ is Lipschitz continuous on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}))$ by Lemma 4-(d).
[27]For $\alpha \in (0,1)$, Lemma 6-(a) has established the continuity of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ in p without assuming $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ to be finite; but the continuity is not uniform.

(e) If $C_{z,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$ then $\{I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})\}_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})}$ is uniformly equicontinuous in α on every compact subset of $(0,z)$. In particular,

$$\sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} |I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) - I_\phi(p;\mathcal{W})| \leq \frac{(\alpha-\phi)}{\epsilon^2} \begin{cases} C_{z,\mathcal{W}} & \forall \epsilon \in (0,\frac{z}{2}),\ \forall \alpha,\phi : \epsilon \leq \phi \leq \alpha \leq z-\epsilon, \quad \text{if } z\in(0,1] \\ \frac{5e^{2C_{z,\mathcal{W}}}}{2e^2} \vee zC_{z,\mathcal{W}} & \forall \epsilon \in (0,\frac{z-1}{8z}), \forall \alpha,\phi : \epsilon \leq \phi \leq \alpha \leq (\phi+\epsilon)\wedge(z-\epsilon), \quad \text{if } z\in(1,\infty) \end{cases}. \tag{40}$$

(f) If $|\mathcal{W}| < \infty$ then $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is increasing and continuous in α on $[0,\infty]$.

The only if part of Lemma 12-(c) can be strengthened as follows: For $\alpha\in(1,\infty]$, if $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}=\infty$ then there exists a sequence $\{p^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}\subset\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ such that $\left\|p-p^{(\imath)}\right\| < \frac{2}{\imath}$ and $\lim_{\imath\to\infty}\left\|\mu_{\alpha,p}-\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\right\|=\infty$. The proof of Lemma 12-(c) establishes this claim in order to establish the weaker claim of the nonexistence of the continuity.

Proof of Lemma 12:

(12-a) $\inf_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})}\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\| = e^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}}$ for any $\alpha\in(0,1)$ because of the definitions of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ and $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ given in (18) and (37).

(12-b) $\sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})}\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\| = e^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}}$ for any $\alpha\in(1,\infty)$ and $\sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})}\|\mu_{\infty,p}\| = e^{C_{\infty,\mathcal{W}}}$ because of the definitions of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ and $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ given in (18) and (37).

(12-c) Let us first prove that if $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}<\infty$ then $\mu_{\alpha,p}$ is uniformly continuous in p. Recall from the proof of part (b) that $\|\mu_{\alpha,s}\| \leq e^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}}$ for any $s\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$. Then as a result of the triangle inequality we have

$$\|\mu_{\alpha,s_1}-\mu_{\alpha,s_2}\| = \|\mu_{\alpha,s_1}\| + \|\mu_{\alpha,s_2}\| \qquad \leq 2e^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}}.$$

Using Lemma 4-(e) we get

$$\|\mu_{\alpha,p_1}-\mu_{\alpha,p_2}\| \leq \|p_1-p_2\|^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} e^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}(C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}+\ln 2)} \qquad \forall\alpha\in(1,\infty), \forall p_1,p_2\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}). \tag{41}$$

We are left with proving that if $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}=\infty$ then $\mu_{\alpha,p}$ is not uniformly continuous in p. For any $s\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ let $s^{(\imath)}$ be,

$$s^{(\imath)} = (1-\tfrac{1}{\imath})s + \tfrac{1}{\imath}p^{(\imath)}$$

where $p^{(\imath)}$'s are such that $\left\|\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\right\| \geq \imath$. The existence of such $p^{(\imath)}$'s follows from part (b). Then

$$\imath^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}} \ll \mu_{\alpha,s^{(\imath)}} \qquad \left\|\mu_{\alpha,s^{(\imath)}}\right\| \geq \imath^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}.$$

Using the triangle inequality we get

$$\left\|s-s^{(\imath)}\right\| \leq \tfrac{2}{\imath} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \left\|\mu_{\alpha,s^{(\imath)}}-\mu_{\alpha,s}\right\| \geq \imath^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} - \|\mu_{\alpha,s}\|.$$

$\|\mu_{\alpha,p}-\mu_{\alpha,s}\|$ is an unbounded function of p on every neighborhood of s, i.e. $\mu_{\alpha,p}$ is not continuous at $p=s$.

(12-d) Recall the decomposition we have in Lemma 4-(c). By the definition of the Renyi information given in (18), the alternative expression for the Renyi divergence given in (25) and the definition of the Renyi mean given in (32) we have

$$I_\alpha(p_1;\mathcal{W}) = \begin{cases} (1-\delta)I_1(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) + (1-\delta)D_1(q_{1,s_\wedge}\|\,\mu_{1,p_1}) + \delta I_1(s_1;\mathcal{W}) + \delta D_1(q_{1,s_1}\|\,\mu_{1,p_1}) & \alpha=1 \\ \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\ln\left[(1-\delta)e^{(\alpha-1)\left(I_\alpha(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W})+D_\alpha\left(q_{\alpha,s_\wedge}\|\mu_{\alpha,p_1}\right)\right)} + \delta e^{(\alpha-1)\left(I_\alpha(s_1;\mathcal{W})+D_\alpha\left(q_{\alpha,s_1}\|\mu_{\alpha,p_1}\right)\right)}\right] & \alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\} \end{cases} \tag{42}$$

where $\delta=\frac{\|p_1-p_2\|}{2}$. Using $\|q_{\alpha,s_1}\|=1$ and $\|q_{\alpha,s_\wedge}\|=1$ together with Lemma 9-(f) we get

$$D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,s_1}\|\,\mu_{\alpha,p_1}) \geq -\ln\|\mu_{\alpha,p_1}\| \qquad \text{and} \qquad D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,s_\wedge}\|\,\mu_{\alpha,p_1}) \geq -\ln\|\mu_{\alpha,p_1}\|.$$

Since $\ln\|\mu_{\alpha,p_1}\| = \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}I_\alpha(p_1;\mathcal{W})$ for all α in $\mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\}$, using equations (42) we get

$$\begin{aligned} I_\alpha(p_1;\mathcal{W}) &\geq \begin{cases} (1-\delta)I_1(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) + \delta I_1(s_1;\mathcal{W}) & \alpha=1 \\ \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\ln\left[(1-\delta)e^{(\alpha-1)I_\alpha(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W})} + \delta e^{(\alpha-1)I_\alpha(s_1;\mathcal{W})}\right] & \alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\} \end{cases} \\ &\geq I_\alpha(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) - g(\delta,\alpha,I_\alpha(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) - I_\alpha(s_1;\mathcal{W})) \end{aligned}$$

where for any $\delta\in[0,1]$, $\alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+$ and $\gamma\in\mathbb{R}$, the function $g(\delta,\alpha,\gamma)$ is given by

$$g(\delta,\alpha,\gamma) = \begin{cases} \delta\gamma & \alpha=1 \\ \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\ln\left[(1-\delta)+\delta e^{(1-\alpha)\gamma}\right] & \alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\} \end{cases}.$$

Note that given δ and γ, the function $g(\delta,\cdot,\gamma)$ is decreasing.[28] Then

$$I_\alpha(p_1;\mathcal{W}) \geq I_\alpha(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) - g(\delta,0,I_\alpha(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) - I_\alpha(s_1;\mathcal{W})) \qquad \forall\alpha\in(0,z].$$

[28] For any fixed (δ,γ), $g(\delta,\alpha,\gamma)$ is a continuous and differentiable function such that

$$\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\alpha}g(\delta,\alpha,\gamma) = \tfrac{1}{(1-\alpha)^2}\left[\tfrac{\delta e^{(1-\alpha)\gamma}}{(1-\delta)+\delta e^{(1-\alpha)\gamma}}\ln\tfrac{(1-\delta)+\delta e^{(1-\alpha)\gamma}}{e^{(1-\alpha)\gamma}} + \tfrac{(1-\delta)}{(1-\delta)+\delta e^{(1-\alpha)\gamma}}\ln((1-\delta)+\delta e^{(1-\alpha)\gamma})\right] \qquad \leq 0.$$

The inequality follows from the concavity of the function $\ln x$ and the Jensen's inequality.

Furthermore, given δ and α, the function $g(\delta,\alpha,\cdot)$ is increasing. Then using $I_\alpha(s_1;\mathcal{W}) \geq 0$, $I_\alpha(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) \leq I_z(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W})$ and $I_z(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) \leq C_{z,\mathcal{W}}$ we get

$$I_\alpha(p_1;\mathcal{W}) \geq I_\alpha(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) - g(\delta,0,C_{z,\mathcal{W}}) \qquad \forall \alpha \in (0,z]. \tag{43}$$

On the other hand, for any positive real number α we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,s_\wedge} \| \mu_{\alpha,p_2}) &= D_\alpha\big(q_{\alpha,s_\wedge} \| \mu_{\alpha,(1-\delta)s_\wedge+\delta s_2}\big) \\ &\leq D_\alpha\Big(q_{\alpha,s_\wedge} \| (1-\delta)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \mu_{\alpha,s_\wedge}\Big) \\ &= \tfrac{(1-\alpha)I_\alpha(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) - \ln(1-\delta)}{\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality follows from Lemma 9-(b). The second equality follows from (25) and (32). Using the corresponding upper bound bound on $D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,s_2} \| \mu_{\alpha,p_2})$ together with (42) we get

$$\begin{aligned} I_\alpha(p_2;\mathcal{W}) &\leq \begin{cases} (1-\delta) I_1(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) + \delta I_1(s_2;\mathcal{W}) - \delta\ln\delta - (1-\delta)\ln(1-\delta) & \alpha = 1 \\ \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\ln\Big[(1-\delta)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} e^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} I_\alpha(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W})} + \delta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} e^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha} I_\alpha(s_2;\mathcal{W})}\Big] & \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{1\} \end{cases} \\ &= I_\alpha(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) + f(\delta,\alpha, I_\alpha(s_2;\mathcal{W}) - I_\alpha(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W})) \end{aligned}$$

where for any $\delta \in [0,1]$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, the function $f(\delta,\alpha,\gamma)$ is given by

$$f(\delta,\alpha,\gamma) = \begin{cases} \delta\gamma - \delta\ln\delta - (1-\delta)\ln(1-\delta) & \alpha = 1 \\ \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\ln\Big[(1-\delta)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + \delta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} e^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\gamma}\Big] & \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{1\} \end{cases}.$$

Note that given δ and γ, the function $f(\delta,\cdot,\gamma)$ is increasing.[29] Then

$$I_\alpha(p_2;\mathcal{W}) \leq I_\alpha(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) + f(\delta,z, I_\alpha(s_2;\mathcal{W}) - I_\alpha(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W})) \qquad \forall \alpha \in (0,z].$$

Furthermore, given δ and α, the function $f(\delta,\alpha,\cdot)$ is increasing. Then using $I_\alpha(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) \geq 0$, $I_\alpha(s_2;\mathcal{W}) \leq I_z(s_2;\mathcal{W})$ and $I_z(s_2;\mathcal{W}) \leq C_{z,\mathcal{W}}$ we get

$$I_\alpha(p_2;\mathcal{W}) \leq I_\alpha(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) + f(\delta,z,C_{z,\mathcal{W}}) \qquad \forall \alpha \in (0,z]. \tag{44}$$

Using (43) and (44) together with the definition of the Renyi capacity given in (37) we get

$$\begin{aligned} I_\alpha(p_2;\mathcal{W}) - I_\alpha(p_1;\mathcal{W}) &\leq f(\delta,z,C_{z,\mathcal{W}}) + g(\delta,0,C_{z,\mathcal{W}}) \\ &\leq \begin{cases} \delta C_{1,\mathcal{W}} - \delta\ln\delta - (1-\delta)\ln(1-\delta) + \ln\big[1-\delta+\delta e^{C_{1,\mathcal{W}}}\big] & z = 1 \\ \frac{z}{z-1}\ln\Big[(1-\delta)^{\frac{1}{z}} + \delta^{\frac{1}{z}} e^{\frac{z-1}{z}C_{z,\mathcal{W}}}\Big] + \ln\big[1-\delta+\delta e^{C_{z,\mathcal{W}}}\big] & z \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{1\} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

A lower bound on $I_\alpha(p_2;\mathcal{W}) - I_\alpha(p_1;\mathcal{W})$ can be obtained using the same arguments with the roles of p_1 and p_2 reversed. Thus equation (39) is established for $z > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0,z]$.

In order to establish (39) for $\alpha = 0$, recall the definition of the order zero Renyi information given in (18).

$$\begin{aligned} I_0(p_1;\mathcal{W}) &= -\ln \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\mu_{1,p_1}} \left((1-\delta) \sum\nolimits_{w:s_\wedge(w|y)>0} s_\wedge(w) + \delta \sum\nolimits_{w:s_1(w|y)>0} s_1(w) \right) \\ &\geq -\ln \left(\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\mu_{1,s_\wedge}} (1-\delta) \sum\nolimits_{w:s_\wedge(w|y)>0} s_\wedge(w) + \delta \right) \\ &= I_0(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) - \ln\left(1-\delta+\delta e^{I_0(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W})}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Note that $I_0(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) \leq I_z(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W})$ because the Renyi information is an increasing function of the order for any prior by Lemma 5. Furthermore, $I_z(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) \leq C_{z,\mathcal{W}}$ by the definition of the Renyi capacity. Then

$$I_0(p_1;\mathcal{W}) \geq I_0(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) - \ln\left(1-\delta+\delta e^{C_{z,\mathcal{W}}}\right). \tag{46}$$

[29] For any fixed (δ,γ), $f(\delta,\alpha,\gamma)$ is a continuous and differentiable function such that

$$\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\alpha} f(\delta,\alpha,\gamma) = \tfrac{1}{(1-\alpha)^2} \left[\tfrac{(1-\delta)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}{(1-\delta)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + \delta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} e^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\gamma}} \ln \tfrac{(1-\delta)^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}}}{(1-\delta)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + \delta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} e^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\gamma}} + \tfrac{\delta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} e^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\gamma}}{(1-\delta)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + \delta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} e^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\gamma}} \ln \tfrac{\delta^{\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}} e^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\gamma}}{(1-\delta)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + \delta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} e^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}\gamma}} \right] \geq 0.$$

The inequality follows from the convexity of the function $x\ln x$ and the Jensen's inequality.

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} I_0(p_2;\mathcal{W}) &= -\ln ess\sup_{\mu_{1,p_2}} \left((1-\delta) \sum\nolimits_{w:s_\wedge(w\mid y)>0} s_\wedge(w) + \delta \sum\nolimits_{w:s_2(w\mid y)>0} s_2(w) \right) \\ &\le \left(-\ln ess\sup_{\mu_{1,s_\wedge}} (1-\delta) \sum\nolimits_{w:s_\wedge(w\mid y)>0} s_\wedge(w) \right) \wedge \left(-\ln ess\sup_{\mu_{1,s_2}} \delta \sum\nolimits_{w:s_2(w\mid y)>0} s_2(w) \right) \\ &= (I_0(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) - \ln(1-\delta)) \wedge (I_0(s_2;\mathcal{W}) - \ln(\delta)) \\ &= I_0(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) + [(-\ln(1-\delta)) \wedge (I_0(s_2;\mathcal{W}) - I_0(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) - \ln(\delta))]. \end{aligned}$$

Using $I_0(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) \ge 0$ and $I_0(s_2;\mathcal{W}) \le I_z(s_2;\mathcal{W}) \le C_{z,\mathcal{W}}$ we get

$$I_0(p_2;\mathcal{W}) = I_0(s_\wedge;\mathcal{W}) + [(-\ln(1-\delta)) \wedge (C_{z,\mathcal{W}} - \ln(\delta))]. \tag{47}$$

Thus using equations (46) and (47) we get

$$I_0(p_2;\mathcal{W}) - I_0(p_1;\mathcal{W}) \le \left[(\ln \tfrac{1}{1-\delta}) \wedge (C_{z,\mathcal{W}} - \ln\delta) \right] + \ln\left((1-\delta) + \delta e^{C_{z,\mathcal{W}}} \right). \tag{48}$$

A lower bound on $I_0(p_2;\mathcal{W}) - I_0(p_1;\mathcal{W})$ can be obtained using the same arguments with the roles of p_1 and p_2 reversed. Consequently, equation (39) holds for $z = 0$, $\alpha = 0$ case. In order to establish (39) for $z > 0$, $\alpha = 0$ case, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \tfrac{z}{z-1} \ln\left[(1-\delta)^{\frac{1}{z}} + \delta^{\frac{1}{z}} e^{\frac{z-1}{z} C_{z,\mathcal{W}}} \right] &= \begin{cases} \ln\frac{1}{1-\delta} + \frac{z}{z-1} \ln\left[1 - \delta + \delta \left(\frac{1-\delta}{\delta e^{-C_{z,\mathcal{W}}}} \right)^{\frac{z-1}{z}} \right] \\ \ln\frac{1}{\delta e^{-C_{z,\mathcal{W}}}} + \frac{z}{z-1} \ln\left[(1-\delta) \left(\frac{\delta e^{-C_{z,\mathcal{W}}}}{1-\delta} \right)^{\frac{z-1}{z}} + \delta \right] \end{cases} \\ &\ge \begin{cases} \ln\frac{1}{1-\delta} & \frac{1}{\delta e^{-C_{z,\mathcal{W}}}} \ge \frac{1}{1-\delta} \\ \ln\frac{1}{\delta e^{-C_{z,\mathcal{W}}}} & \frac{1-\delta}{\delta e^{-C_{z,\mathcal{W}}}} \le \frac{1}{1-\delta} \end{cases} \\ &\ge \left[\ln\frac{1}{1-\delta} \wedge \ln\frac{1}{\delta e^{-C_{z,\mathcal{W}}}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Thus inequality (39) holds for $z > 0$, $\alpha = 0$ case, as well.

(12-e) Recall that $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|^\alpha$ is a log-convexity function of α by Lemma 3-(d). Then

$$\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|^\alpha \le \|\mu_{\eta,p}\|^{\eta\frac{\alpha-\phi}{\eta-\phi}} \|\mu_{\phi,p}\|^{\phi\frac{\eta-\alpha}{\eta-\phi}} \qquad 0 < \phi < \alpha < \eta < \infty,\ \forall p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}).$$

Let us first consider the case $z \in (0,1]$ and chose an $\epsilon \in (1, \frac{z}{2})$. Then for any ϕ, α, η such that $0 < \phi < \epsilon \le \alpha < \eta \le z - \epsilon$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_\eta(p;\mathcal{W}) - I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) &= \tfrac{1}{1-\alpha} \ln \frac{\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|^\alpha}{\|\mu_{\eta,p}\|^{\frac{\eta(1-\alpha)}{1-\eta}}} \le \tfrac{1}{1-\alpha} \ln \frac{\|\mu_{\eta,p}\|^{\eta\frac{\alpha-\phi}{\eta-\phi}} \|\mu_{\phi,p}\|^{\phi\frac{\eta-\alpha}{\eta-\phi}}}{\|\mu_{\eta,p}\|^{\frac{\eta(1-\alpha)}{1-\eta}}} = \tfrac{(\eta-\alpha)(1-\phi)}{(1-\alpha)(\eta-\phi)} (I_\eta(p;\mathcal{W}) - I_\phi(p;\mathcal{W})) \\ &\le \tfrac{\eta-\alpha}{\epsilon(\epsilon-\phi)} I_\eta(p;\mathcal{W}). \end{aligned}$$

The above bound holds for any ϕ in $(0,\epsilon)$. Furthermore, the Renyi information is an increasing function of the order by Lemma 5. Then

$$|I_\eta(p;\mathcal{W}) - I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})| \le \tfrac{|\eta-\alpha|}{\epsilon^2} C_{z,\mathcal{W}} \qquad \forall \eta,\alpha \in [\epsilon, z-\epsilon],\ \forall p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}). \tag{49}$$

For the case when $z \in (1,\infty)$ choose an $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{z-1}{8z})$. For any ϕ, α, η such that $1 + \epsilon \le \phi < \alpha \le \eta - \epsilon$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) - I_\phi(p;\mathcal{W}) &= \tfrac{1}{\alpha-1} \ln \frac{\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|^\alpha}{\|\mu_{\phi,p}\|^{\frac{\phi(\alpha-1)}{\phi-1}}} \le \tfrac{1}{\alpha-1} \ln \frac{\|\mu_{\eta,p}\|^{\eta\frac{\alpha-\phi}{\eta-\phi}} \|\mu_{\phi,p}\|^{\phi\frac{\eta-\alpha}{\eta-\phi}}}{\|\mu_{\phi,p}\|^{\frac{\phi(\alpha-1)}{\phi-1}}} = \tfrac{(\alpha-\phi)(\eta-1)}{(\alpha-1)(\eta-\phi)} (I_\eta(p;\mathcal{W}) - I_\phi(p;\mathcal{W})) \\ &\le \tfrac{(\alpha-\phi)\eta}{\epsilon^2} C_{\eta,\mathcal{W}}. \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

If $\alpha - \phi < \epsilon$ then at least one of the three closed intervals $[\epsilon, 1-\epsilon]$, $[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{5z-1}{4z}]$, $[1+\epsilon, z-\epsilon]$ includes both α and ϕ. When α and ϕ are in $[\epsilon, 1-\epsilon]$ we use (49). When α and ϕ are in $[1+\epsilon, z-\epsilon]$ we use (50). Derivation of the bound for the second interval takes some effort. Let us first finish the proof of the equicontinuity assuming the bound for the second interval given in (51). Then for any ϕ, α such that $\epsilon \le \phi \le \alpha \le \min\{\phi+\epsilon, z-\epsilon\}$ we have

$$|I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) - I_\phi(p;\mathcal{W})| \le \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha-\phi}{\epsilon^2} C_{z,\mathcal{W}} & \epsilon \le \phi \le \alpha \le \phi + \epsilon \le 1 \\ (\alpha-\phi) \frac{160 z^2}{e^2 (z-1)^2} e^{2C_{z,\mathcal{W}}} & \frac{1}{2} \le \phi \le \alpha \le \phi + \epsilon \le \frac{5z-1}{4z} \\ \frac{\alpha-\phi}{\epsilon^2} z C_{z,\mathcal{W}} & 1 + \epsilon \le \phi \le \alpha \le (\phi+\epsilon) \wedge (z-\epsilon) \end{cases}$$

Thus for any $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{z-1}{8z})$ and α, ϕ such that $\epsilon \leq \phi \leq \alpha \leq (\phi+\epsilon) \wedge (z-\epsilon)$ we have

$$|I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) - I_\phi(p;\mathcal{W})| \leq \tfrac{|\alpha-\phi|}{\epsilon^2}\left[\tfrac{5e^{2C_{z,\mathcal{W}}}}{2e^2} \vee zC_{z,\mathcal{W}}\right] \qquad \forall p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}).$$

Hence $\{I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})\}_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})}$ is a uniformly equicontinuous function of α on $[\epsilon, z-\epsilon]$. Now we are left with establishing the bound given (51). Recall that by (21) we have

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) = \tfrac{1}{\alpha-1}\left[\alpha \tfrac{\left\|\mu'_{\alpha,p}\right\|}{\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|} + \ln\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\| - I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})\right]$$

The expression in the brackets is differentiable and continuous for $\alpha \in (0,\infty)$ because $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|$, $\left\|\mu'_{\alpha,p}\right\|$ and $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ are differentiable and continuous and $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\| > 0$ by Lemma 3-(b,c), Lemma 5 and Lemma 1-(a). Furthermore, the expression in the brackets is equal to zero at $\alpha = 1$. Then as a result of the mean value theorem [58, 5.10] for each $\alpha \in (1,\infty)$ there exists a $\phi \in (1,\alpha)$ and such that

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) = \tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}\left[\alpha \tfrac{\left\|\mu'_{\alpha,p}\right\|}{\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|} + \ln\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\| - I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})\right]\Big|_{\alpha=\phi} = \left[\tfrac{1}{\phi}\int \mathbf{V}_{p_{[\phi]}}\left[\ln\tfrac{p_{[1]}}{p\pi_{\phi,p}}\right] q_{\phi,p}(\mathrm{d}y)\right] - \tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})\big|_{\alpha=\phi}$$

where $\mathbf{V}_{p_{[\alpha]}}\left[\ln\frac{p_{[1]}}{p\pi_{\alpha,p}}\right]$ is the variance of $\ln\frac{p_{[1]}}{p\pi_{\alpha,p}}$ under $p_{[\alpha]}$ given by

$$\mathbf{V}_{p_{[\alpha]}}\left[\ln\tfrac{p_{[1]}}{p\pi_{\alpha,p}}\right] = \sum\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} p_{[\alpha]}(w|y)\left(\ln\tfrac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)\pi_{\alpha,p}}\right)^2 - \left(\sum\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} p_{[\alpha]}(w|y)\ln\tfrac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)\pi_{\alpha,p}}\right)^2.$$

Similarly for all $\alpha \in (0,1)$ there exists a $\phi \in (\alpha,1)$ satisfying same identity. Furthermore, one can confirm by substitution for the expression given in equation (21) that

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})\big|_{\alpha=1} = \tfrac{1}{2}\left[\int \mathbf{V}_{p_{[1]}}\left[\ln\tfrac{p_{[1]}}{p}\right] q_{1,p}(\mathrm{d}y)\right].$$

Thus

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) \leq 2\sup\nolimits_{\phi\in[\frac{1}{2},\frac{5z-1}{4z}]} \int \tfrac{\pi_{\phi,p}}{\|\mu_{\phi,p}\|}\mathbf{V}_{p_{[\phi]}}\left[\ln\tfrac{p_{[1]}}{p\pi_{\phi,p}}\right] q_{1,p}(\mathrm{d}y) \qquad \forall\alpha \in \left[\tfrac{1}{2}, \tfrac{5z-1}{4z}\right].$$

For $x \in [0,1]$, $x^\alpha \ln^2 x \leq (\frac{2}{\alpha e})^2$ and for $x \geq 1$ then $\ln^2 x \leq (\frac{2}{\eta e})^2 x^\eta$. For any $\frac{1}{2} \leq \alpha < \eta < \frac{3}{2}$

$$\begin{aligned} x^\alpha \ln^2 x &\leq \mathbb{1}_{\{x\in[0,1]\}} x^\alpha \ln^2 x + \mathbb{1}_{\{x>1\}} x^\alpha \ln^2 x && \leq \mathbb{1}_{\{x\in[0,1]\}}\tfrac{4e^{-2}}{\alpha^2} + \mathbb{1}_{\{x>1\}} x^\alpha \left(\tfrac{2e^{-1}}{(\eta-\alpha)}\right)^2 x^{\eta-\alpha} \\ &\leq \mathbb{1}_{\{x\in[0,1]\}}\tfrac{4e^{-2}}{\alpha^2} + \mathbb{1}_{\{x>1\}}\tfrac{4e^{-2}}{(\eta-\alpha)^2} x^\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Then using the identity $\frac{p_{[\alpha]}}{p} = (\frac{p_{[1]}}{p\pi_{\alpha,p}})^\alpha$

$$\mathbf{V}_{p_{[\alpha]}}\left[\ln\tfrac{p_{[1]}}{p\pi_{\alpha,p}}\right] \leq \sum\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} p(w)\left(\tfrac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)\pi_{\alpha,p}}\right)^\alpha \left(\ln\tfrac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)\pi_{\alpha,p}}\right)^2 \qquad \leq \tfrac{4e^{-2}}{\alpha^2} + \tfrac{4e^{-2}}{(\eta-\alpha)^2}\left(\tfrac{\pi_{\eta,p}}{\pi_{\alpha,p}}\right)^\eta.$$

Since ${\pi_{\alpha,p}}^\alpha$ is log convex in α by Lemma 2-(c), i.e. $(\pi_{\alpha_\beta,p})^{\alpha_\beta} \leq (\pi_{\alpha_1,p})^{\beta\alpha_1}(\pi_{\alpha_0,p})^{(1-\beta)\alpha_0}$ where $\alpha_\beta = \beta\alpha_1 + (1-\beta)\alpha_0$. For any $\eta \in (1,\frac{3}{2})$ and $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2},\frac{5}{4}]$, using $\alpha_0 = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\eta+1}$, $\alpha_1 = \alpha$, $\beta = \frac{\eta-1}{\alpha}$ we get $\alpha_\beta = \eta$. Hence

$$(\pi_{\eta,p})^\eta \leq (\pi_{\alpha,p})^{\eta-1}\pi_{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-\eta+1},p} \qquad \leq (\pi_{\alpha,p})^{\eta-1}\pi_{\frac{1}{3-2\eta},p}.$$

Let $\eta = \frac{3z-1}{2z}$ then for any $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{5z-1}{4z}]$ we have

$$\mathbf{V}_{p_{[\alpha]}}\left[\ln\tfrac{p_{[1]}}{p\pi_{\alpha,p}}\right] \leq 16e^{-2} + \tfrac{4e^{-2}}{(\frac{3z-1}{2z}-\alpha)^2}\tfrac{\pi_{z,p}}{\pi_{\alpha,p}} \qquad \leq 16e^{-2} + \tfrac{64e^{-2}z^2}{(z-1)^2}\tfrac{\pi_{z,p}}{\pi_{\alpha,p}}.$$

Hence for any $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{5z-1}{4z}]$ we have

$$\int \tfrac{\pi_{\alpha,p}}{\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|}\mathbf{V}_{p_{[\alpha]}}\left[\ln\tfrac{p_{[1]}}{p\pi_{\alpha,p}}\right] q_{1,p}(\mathrm{d}y) \leq 16e^{-2} + \tfrac{64e^{-2}z^2}{(z-1)^2}\tfrac{\|\mu_{z,p}\|}{\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|} \qquad \leq 16e^{-2} + \tfrac{64e^{-2}z^2}{(z-1)^2} e^{\frac{z-1}{z}C_{z,\mathcal{W}} + C_{\frac{1}{2},\mathcal{W}}}.$$

Thus

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) \leq 32e^{-2} + \tfrac{128e^{-2}z^2}{(z-1)^2} e^{2C_{z,\mathcal{W}}} \qquad \forall\alpha \in \left[\tfrac{1}{2}, \tfrac{5z-1}{4z}\right], \forall p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}).$$

Since $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ is positive we get

$$|I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) - I_\phi(p;\mathcal{W})| \leq |\alpha-\phi|\tfrac{160z^2}{e^2(z-1)^2} e^{2C_{z,\mathcal{W}}} \qquad \forall p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}). \tag{51}$$

(12-f) For any $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$, $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ is an increasing continuous function of α on $[0,\infty]$ by Lemma 5. Then for any $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$, $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ is a quasi-convex continuous function of α satisfying $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) = \inf_{z\in(\alpha,\infty)} I_z(p;\mathcal{W})$. Using the definition $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ given in (37) we get

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = \sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} \inf_{z\in(\alpha,\infty)} I_z(p;\mathcal{W}) \qquad \forall \alpha \in [0,\infty). \tag{52}$$

If $\mathcal{W}$ is a finite set then $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) \le \ln|\mathcal{W}|$ by Lemma 5. Hence $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is finite for all $\alpha \in [0,\infty)$ and $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ is continuous in p on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ for all $\alpha \in [0,\infty)$ by part (d). Furthermore $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ is quasi concave in p for all $\alpha \in [0,\infty)$ by Lemma 6. On the other hand $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ is a compact set because $\mathcal{W}$ is a finite set. Then we can apply Sion's minimax theorem, [67, Corollary 3.3],[46] to the expression for $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ given in equation (52) and change the order of the sup and the inf.

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} &= \inf_{z\in(\alpha,\infty)} \sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} I_z(p;\mathcal{W}) \\ &= \inf_{z\in(\alpha,\infty)} C_{z,\mathcal{W}} \qquad \forall \alpha \in [0,\infty). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is continuous from the right. $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is continuous from the left because $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is increasing and lower semicontinuous on $[0,\infty]$ by Lemma 11-(a). Thus $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is an increasing continuous function on $[0,\infty]$.

■

C. The Renyi Radius and Max-Min Inequality

Definition 8. For any measurable space $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, $q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, and $\alpha \in [0,\infty]$, *the order α Renyi radius of $\mathcal{W}$* and *the order α relative Renyi radius of $\mathcal{W}$ with respect to q* are

$$S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \triangleq \inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} \sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} D_\alpha(w\|\, q) \qquad S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(q) \triangleq \sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} D_\alpha(w\|\, q)\,. \tag{53}$$

Considering p's in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ satisfying $p(w)=1$ for a w in $\mathcal{W}$ and the inequality $D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q) \le \max_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} D_\alpha(w\|\, q)$, which is valid for all $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ and $q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, we get the following expressions for $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ and $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(q)$

$$S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = \inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} \sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q) \qquad S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(q) = \sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q)\,. \tag{54}$$

Lemma 13. *For any measurable space $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, and $\alpha \in [0,\infty]$*

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \le \inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} \sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q) \qquad = S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}. \tag{55}$$

Proof of Lemma 13: Note that $\sup_{z\in\mathcal{Z}} \inf_{x\in\mathcal{X}} f(x,z) \le \inf_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \sup_{z\in\mathcal{Z}} f(x,z)$ for any function f. Then (55) follows from (38) and (54). ■

For finite α, $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ does not have a closed form expression. Certain symmetries of the elements of $\mathcal{W}$ or numerical calculations, might suggest an educated guess for a prior p such that $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. We can use Lemma 13 to confirm the conjectured optimality, when we are provided with such a prior p. If $\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} D_\alpha(w\|\, q_{\alpha,p}) \le I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ then $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \le I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ by the definition of $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. On the other hand $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) \le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ by definition of $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ and $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \le S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ by Lemma 13. Thus $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. At times the educated guess might be a sequence of priors $\{p^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ which is conjectured to be optimal in the sense that $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. We can use Lemma 13 to confirm the conjectured optimality of such a sequence, as well. If $\{q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ is a Cauchy sequence then it has a unique limit point q_*. If $\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} D_\alpha(w\|\, q_*) \le \lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W})$ then following a similar reasoning we can conclude that $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = \lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. One might be curious whether or not $\{q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ is a Cauchy sequence for all $\{p^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ satisfying $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$; Theorem 1 answers this question in the affirmative. We apply this technique to determine $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ in Examples 1, 2, 8 and in Appendix E.

IV. The Renyi Center and The Alternative Characterization of The Renyi Capacity

The max-min inequality given in Lemma 13 is in fact an equality. Resulting minimax theorem given below constitutes an alternative characterization of the Renyi capacity. For $\alpha = 1$ case, Kemperman [45, Theorem 1] proved the minimax equality and the existence and uniqueness of $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. Prior to [45], Augustin [4] described a method to prove the same assertions for $\alpha \in (0,1)$ case. After [45], Augustin proved a result [5, Theorem 26.6'] implying the same assertions for $\alpha \in (0,2)$ case. Certain generalizations of Theorem 1 can be found Appendices F and G.

Theorem 1. *For any measurable space $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, and $\alpha \in (0,\infty]$*

$$\sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} \inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q) = \inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} \sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q) \tag{56}$$

$$= \inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} \sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} D_\alpha(w\|\, q)\,. \tag{57}$$

If $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$ for an $\alpha \in (0,\infty]$ then there exists a unique $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ such that

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = \sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}) \tag{58}$$

$$= \sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} D_\alpha(w\|\, q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}})\,. \tag{59}$$

Furthermore, for every sequence of priors $\{p^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ such that $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\big(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}\big) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$, corresponding sequence of the order α Renyi means $\{q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ for the total variation metric on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ and $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is the unique limit point of that Cauchy sequence.

Definition 9. For any measurable space $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, $\mathcal{W}\subset\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, and $\alpha\in(0,\infty]$ such that $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}<\infty$, the unique probability measure $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ satisfying (58) is called the order α Renyi center of $\mathcal{W}$.

Equation (58) implies as a result of equation (33) that

$$D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,p}\|\, q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}) \le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} - I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) \qquad\qquad \forall p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}). \tag{60}$$

The supremum of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ over $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ is $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ by definition and $D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,p}\|\, q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}})$ is non-negative by Lemma 9-(g). Thus equation (60) implies equation (58), as well. Equation (60) can also be interpreted as a p dependent improvement of the uniform bound $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})\le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. As a result of equation (60), if $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ is close to $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$, then $D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,p}\|\, q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}})$ is close to zero.

In Section IV-A we first prove Theorem 1 then we give a brief discussion of alternative proofs based on Sion's minimax theorem. In Section IV-B we first prove a lower bound on $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(q)$, i.e. Erven-Harremoes bound, then we use this bound to establish the continuity of the Renyi center as a function of the order. Section IV-C is composed of various applications of Theorem 1 and Erven-Harremoes bound, i.e. Lemma 16.

A. Minimax Theorems and The Relative Compactness

We first prove Theorem 1 for the case when $\mathcal{W}$ is a finite set. Theorem 1 can be strengthened slightly for finite $\mathcal{W}$'s because the existence of an optimal prior is guaranteed. The optimal prior, however, is not necessarily unique. There are $\mathcal{W}$'s for which more than one p satisfies $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})=C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. Even then all such p's have exactly the same order α Renyi mean. For finite $\mathcal{Y}$ case, Lemma 14 is well known, though in a slightly different form, see [30, Theorem 4.5.1], [20, p.128] for $\alpha=1$ case and [30, Theorem 5.6.5], [20, p.172] for $\alpha\in(0,1)$ case. Csiszar's result [17, Theorem 3.2] implies Lemma 14 for $\alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+$ case.

Lemma 14. *Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space, $\mathcal{W}$ be a finite subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$. Then for any $\alpha\in[0,\infty]$, $\exists\widetilde{p}\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ such that $I_\alpha(\widetilde{p};\mathcal{W})=C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. If $\alpha\in(0,\infty]$ then $\exists! q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ such that,*

$$D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,p}\|\, q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}) \le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} - I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) \qquad\qquad \forall p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}). \tag{61}$$

Hence, $q_{\alpha,\widetilde{p}}=q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for all $\widetilde{p}$ such that $I_\alpha(\widetilde{p};\mathcal{W})=C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. Furthermore,

$$C_{\infty,\mathcal{W}} = \ln\Big\|\bigvee\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{W}} w\Big\| \qquad\qquad q_{\infty,\mathcal{W}} = \Big(\bigvee\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{W}} w\Big)\, e^{-C_{\infty,\mathcal{W}}}. \tag{62}$$

Proof of Lemma 14:

- *$\alpha\in[0,\infty)$ case:*

(i) *$\exists\widetilde{p}\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ such that $I_\alpha(\widetilde{p};\mathcal{W})=C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$:* Since $|\mathcal{X}_p|\le|\mathcal{W}|$ for all $p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$, $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}\le\ln|\mathcal{W}|$ by Lemma 5. Then $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ is continuous on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ by Lemma 12-(d). On the other hand, if $\mathcal{W}$ is a finite set then $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ is compact. Then there exists a $\widetilde{p}\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ such that $I_\alpha(\widetilde{p};\mathcal{W})=\sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ by the extreme value theorem, [53, 27.4].

(ii) *If $\alpha\in(0,\infty)$ and $I_\alpha(\widetilde{p};\mathcal{W})=C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ then $D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,p}\|\, q_{\alpha,\widetilde{p}})\le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}-I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ for all $p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$:* Let $\widetilde{p}\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ be such that $I_\alpha(\widetilde{p};\mathcal{W})=C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$, p be any member of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ and $p^{(\imath)}$ be $p^{(\imath)}=\frac{\imath-1}{\imath}\widetilde{p}+\frac{1}{\imath}p$ for $\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+$. Then

$$I_\alpha\Big(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}\Big)=\begin{cases}\frac{\imath-1}{\imath}I_1(\widetilde{p};\mathcal{W})+\frac{\imath-1}{\imath}D_1\Big(q_{1,\widetilde{p}}\|\, q_{1,p^{(\imath)}}\Big)+\frac{1}{\imath}I_1(p;\mathcal{W})+\frac{1}{\imath}D_1\Big(q_{1,p}\|\, q_{1,p^{(\imath)}}\Big) & \alpha=1\\ \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\ln\Big[\frac{\imath-1}{\imath}e^{(\alpha-1)\left(I_\alpha(\widetilde{p};\mathcal{W})+D_\alpha\left(q_{\alpha,\widetilde{p}}\|\, q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\right)\right)}+\frac{1}{\imath}e^{(\alpha-1)\left(I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})+D_\alpha\left(q_{\alpha,p}\|\, q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\right)\right)}\Big] & \alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\}\end{cases}$$

Then using $I_\alpha\big(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}\big)\le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ and $D_\alpha\Big(q_{\alpha,\widetilde{p}}\|\, q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\Big)\ge 0$ we get

$$I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})+D_\alpha\Big(q_{\alpha,p}\|\, q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\Big)\le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}. \tag{63}$$

For $\alpha\in(0,1]$, $\mu_{\alpha,p}$ is continuous in p because of Lemma 4-(d). For $\alpha\in(1,\infty)$, $\mu_{\alpha,p}$ is continuous in p because $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}\le\ln|\mathcal{W}|$ is finite, Lemma 12-(c). Consequently, $\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\to\mu_{\alpha,\widetilde{p}}$ in total variation topology because $p^{(\imath)}\to\widetilde{p}$, [53, Theorem 21.3]. Hence $\Big\|\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\Big\|\to\|\mu_{\alpha,\widetilde{p}}\|$ and $q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\to q_{\alpha,\widetilde{p}}$ in the topology of setwise convergence. Since the Renyi divergence is lower semicontinuous in the topology of setwise convergence by Lemma 7, we have

$$D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,p}\|\, q_{\alpha,\widetilde{p}})\le\lim_{\imath\to\infty} D_\alpha\Big(q_{\alpha,p}\|\, q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\Big) \tag{64}$$

Equation (61) follows from equations (63) and (64) for $q_{\alpha,\widetilde{p}}=q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$.

(iii) *If $\alpha \in (0,\infty)$ then $\exists! q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ satisfying (61) such that $q_{\alpha,\widetilde{p}} = q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for all $\widetilde{p}$ with $I_\alpha(\widetilde{p};\mathcal{W}) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$:* For $\mu, q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, $D_\alpha(\mu \| q) > 0$ unless $\mu = q$ by Lemma 9-(g). Consequently if $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for a $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ then $q_{\alpha,p} = q_{\alpha,\widetilde{p}}$ because otherwise $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) < C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. Then $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is the unique $q_{\alpha,p}$ for any p satisfying $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$.

- *$\alpha = \infty$ case:* By the definitions of $\mu_{\infty,p}$, $q_{\infty,p}$ and $I_\infty(p;\mathcal{W})$ given in equations (2), (32) and (18), respectively we have

$$q_{\infty,p} = (\bigvee\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} w)e^{-I_\infty(p;\mathcal{W})} \qquad I_\infty(p;\mathcal{W}) = \ln\Big\|\bigvee\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} w\Big\| \qquad \forall p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}). \tag{65}$$

Then for any $\widetilde{p} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ such that $\widetilde{p}(w) > 0$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$,

$$q_{\infty,\widetilde{p}} = (\bigvee\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{W}} w)e^{-I_\infty(\widetilde{p};\mathcal{W})} \qquad I_\infty(\widetilde{p};\mathcal{W}) = \ln\Big\|\bigvee\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{W}} w\Big\|. \tag{66}$$

Then $w \le q_{\alpha,\widetilde{p}} e^{I_\infty(\widetilde{p};\mathcal{W})}$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$. Then by the alternative expression for Renyi divergence given in (25) we have

$$D_\infty(w\|\, q_{\alpha,\widetilde{p}}) \le I_\infty(\widetilde{p};\mathcal{W}) \qquad \forall w \in \mathcal{W}.$$

Then by Lemma 13 we have $C_{\infty,\mathcal{W}} \le I_\infty(\widetilde{p};\mathcal{W})$. Thus $C_{\infty,\mathcal{W}} = \ln\big\|\bigvee_{w\in\mathcal{W}} w\big\|$. Using equation (66) and the alternative expression for the Renyi divergence given in (25) we get

$$D_\infty(q_{\infty,p}\|\, q_{\infty,\mathcal{W}}) = C_{\infty,\mathcal{W}} - I_\infty(p;\mathcal{W}) + \ln ess\sup_{q_{\infty,p}} \frac{\bigvee_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} w}{\bigvee_{w\in\mathcal{W}} w} \qquad \le C_{\infty,\mathcal{W}} - I_\infty(p;\mathcal{W})\,.$$

The uniqueness of $q_{\infty,\mathcal{W}}$ follows from (61) and Lemma 9-(g).

■

When $\mathcal{W}$ is not a finite but an arbitrary set of probability measures, we can not invoke the extreme value theorem to establish the existence a p satisfying $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ because $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ is not compact. Assuming $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ to be finite, Theorem 1 recovers all assertions of Lemma 14, but the existence of a p satisfying $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$, albeit in a weaker form.

Proof of Theorem 1: First note that (56) implies (57) and (58) implies (59) because of (54). Furthermore, the left hand side of (56) is equal to $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ by (38). Thus when $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is infinite (56) holds trivially because of Lemma 13. When $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is finite (56) follows from (58) and Lemma 13. Thus we can assume $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ to be finite and prove the claims about $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$, in order to prove the theorem.

(i) *If $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$ and $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ then $\{q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ for the total variation metric:* For any sequence $\{p^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ of members of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ satisfying $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$, let $\{\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ be a nested sequence of finite subsets of $\mathcal{W}$ defined as follows,

$$\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)} \triangleq \cup_{\jmath=1}^{\imath} \mathcal{X}_{p^{(\jmath)}}.$$

Then for any $\imath \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, there exists a unique $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}$ satisfying (61) by Lemma 14. Furthermore, $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}^{(\jmath)}) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)})$ for any $\imath,\jmath \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\jmath \le \imath$. In order to bound $\Big\|q_{\alpha,p^{(\jmath)}} - q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\Big\|$ for positive integers $\jmath < \imath$ we use the triangle inequality for $q_{\alpha,p^{(\jmath)}}$, $q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}$ and $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}$

$$\Big\|q_{\alpha,p^{(\jmath)}} - q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\Big\| \le \Big\|q_{\alpha,p^{(\jmath)}} - q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}\Big\| + \Big\|q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}} - q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}\Big\|. \tag{67}$$

Let us proceed with bounding $\Big\|q_{\alpha,p^{(\jmath)}} - q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}\Big\|$ and $\Big\|q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}} - q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}\Big\|$.

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\|q_{\alpha,p^{(\jmath)}} - q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}\Big\|^2 &\overset{(a)}{\le} 4(\tfrac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\vee 1) D_\alpha\Big(q_{\alpha,p^{(\jmath)}}\Big\|\, q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}\Big)\\ &\overset{(b)}{\le} 4(\tfrac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\vee 1)\Big[C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} - I_\alpha\Big(p^{(\jmath)};\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}\Big)\Big]\\ &\overset{(c)}{\le} 4(\tfrac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\vee 1)\Big[C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} - I_\alpha\Big(p^{(\jmath)};\mathcal{W}\Big)\Big].\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Lemma 9-(h), (b) follows from Lemma 14 because $\widetilde{p}^{(\jmath)} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)})$, and (c) follows from the identities $I_\alpha\big(p^{(\jmath)};\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}\big) = I_\alpha\big(p^{(\jmath)};\mathcal{W}\big)$ and $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. We can obtain a similar bound on $\Big\|q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}} - q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}\Big\|^2$. Then $\{q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\}$ is a Cauchy sequence by equation (67).

(ii) *If $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$ then $\exists!$ $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ s.t. $\lim_{\imath\to\infty}\Big\|q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} - q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\Big\| = 0$ $\forall\{p^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ s.t. $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\big(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}\big) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$:* Note that $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ is a complete metric space for the total variation metric, i.e. every Cauchy sequence has a unique limit point in $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, because $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ is a Banach space for the total variation topology [7, Theorem 4.6.1]. Then $\{q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ has a unique limit point $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ in $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$. Since $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ is a closed set for the total variation topology and $\cup_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+} q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ then $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, by [53, Theorem 2.1.3].

We have established the existence and the uniqueness of the limit point $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$, for any sequence $\{p^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ satisfying $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\big(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}\big) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. But we have not ruled out the possibility of distinct limit points for different sequences satisfying the constraint. Let $\{p^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ and $\{\widetilde{p}^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ be two sequences satisfying $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\big(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}\big) = \lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\big(\widetilde{p}^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}\big) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$, with limit points $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ and $q_{\alpha,\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}}$. Let $\{\widehat{p}^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ be a sequence whose elements for the odd indices are the elements of $\{p^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ and whose elements for the even indices are the elements of $\{\widetilde{p}^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$. Then $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\big(\widehat{p}^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}\big) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$; consequently the sequence $\{q_{\alpha,\widehat{p}^{(\imath)}}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ is Cauchy. Thus $\{q_{\alpha,\widehat{p}^{(\imath)}}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ and all of its subsequences has the same unique limit point $q_{\alpha,\widehat{\mathcal{W}}}$. Then $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = q_{\alpha,\widehat{\mathcal{W}}} = q_{\alpha,\widetilde{\mathcal{W}}}$.

(iii) $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ *satisfies the equality given in (58):* Let us first prove that $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ satisfies the inequality given in (60). For any $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$, let us consider any sequence $\{p^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ satisfying $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\big(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}\big) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ such that $p^{(1)} = p$. Then $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)})$ for all positive integers $\imath$. Using inequality (61) of Lemma 14 we get

$$D_\alpha\big(q_{\alpha,p}\|\, q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}\big) \leq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} - I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) \qquad\qquad \forall\imath. \tag{68}$$

Since $\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}$ is a finite set, $\exists\widetilde{p}^{(\imath)} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)})$ satisfying $I_\alpha\big(\widetilde{p}^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}\big) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}$ and $q_{\alpha,\widetilde{p}^{(\imath)}} = q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}$ by Lemma 14. Then $I_\alpha\big(\widetilde{p}^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}\big) \geq I_\alpha\big(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}\big)$ and consequently $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\big(\widetilde{p}^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}\big) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. We have already established that for such a sequence $q_{\alpha,\widetilde{p}^{(\imath)}} \to q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ in the total variation topology, and hence in the topology of setwise convergence. Then the lower semicontinuity of the Renyi divergence, i.e. Lemma 7, the identity $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \leq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ and equation (68) imply the inequality given in (60).

Using equations (33) and (60) together the non-negativity of $D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}})$, i.e. Lemma 9-(g), we get

$$I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) \leq D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}) \leq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \qquad\qquad \forall p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}).$$

Then equation (58) follows from the fact that the supremum of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ over p's in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ is equal to $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$.

■

Theorem 1 is not just a minimax theorem, the assertions of about the Renyi center are crucial. But those assertions can be derived separately if need be. Leaving them aside, we discuss in the rest of this subsection when equation (56) can be proved using Sion's minimax Theorem [46], [67].

Note that $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ is compact iff $\mathcal{W}$ is a finite set and $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ is compact iff $\mathcal{Y}$ is a finite set. Consequently, when either $\mathcal{W}$ or $\mathcal{Y}$ is finite equation (56) is an immediate consequence[30] of Sion's minimax theorem [46], [67]. When $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are both infinite sets, however, neither $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ nor $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ is compact —for the total variation topology— and we can not directly apply Sion's minimax theorem. Yet, it is possible to recover partial results using the concept of relative compactness.

First note that as a result of Lemma 10

$$\inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q) = \inf_{q\in\mathtt{cl}\mathcal{Q}_{(\alpha,\mathcal{W})}} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q) \qquad\qquad \forall p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}),\ \forall\alpha\in(0,\infty)$$

where $\mathcal{Q}_{(\alpha,\mathcal{W})}$ is the convex hull of the set of all order α Renyi means for the priors in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$:

$$\mathcal{Q}_{(\alpha,\mathcal{W})} \triangleq \mathtt{ch}\{q_{\alpha,p} : p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})\}.$$

If $\mathcal{Q}_{(\alpha,\mathcal{W})}$ is relatively compact in the topology of setwise convergence by Sion's minimax theorem we have[31]

$$\sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})}\inf_{q\in\mathtt{cl}\mathcal{Q}_{(\alpha,\mathcal{W})}} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q) = \inf_{q\in\mathtt{cl}\mathcal{Q}_{(\alpha,\mathcal{W})}}\sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q)\,.$$

Then using the fact that $\mathtt{cl}\mathcal{Q}_{(\alpha,\mathcal{W})} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ we get,

$$\sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})}\inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q) \geq \inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})}\sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q)\,.$$

The reverse inequality is the max-min inequality, which is always valid. Thus (56) holds.

Recall that a set of finite measures $\mathcal{X}$ is relatively compact, i.e. has a compact closure, in the topology of setwise convergence iff there exists a $\mu\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ such that $\mathcal{X}\prec^{uni}\mu$ by a version of Dunford-Pettis theorem [7, 4.7.25]. Using de la Vallee Poussin theorem [7, 4.5.9] for $\alpha\geq 1$ case and monotonicity of the order α power mean $\mu_{\alpha,p}$ in order, i.e. Lemma 3-(b), we can obtain sufficient conditions for the relative compactness of $\mathcal{Q}_{(\alpha,\mathcal{W})}$ in the topology of setwise convergence. As a result we get the following partial result:

Lemma 15. *Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space and $\mathcal{W}$ be subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$.*

(i) If $\exists\mu\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ such that $\mathcal{W}\prec^{uni}\mu$ and $S_{z,\mathcal{W}}<\infty$ for a $z\in(0,1)$ then (56) holds $\forall\alpha\in(0,1)$.

(ii) If $S_{z,\mathcal{W}}<\infty$ for a $z\in[1,\infty]$ then (56) holds for $\alpha\in(0,z]$.

[30] Immediate after establishing that $D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q)$ is quasiconcave and upper semicontinuous in p. The quasiconvexity and the lower semicontinuity of $D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q)$ in q follows from Lemma 7 and Lemma 9-(d).

[31] Again, we can use Sion's minimax theorem only after establishing that $D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q)$ is quasiconcave and upper semicontinuous in p. But it is possible to do so given the hypothesis of Lemma 15.

B. Erven-Harremoes Bound and The Renyi Center as a Function of The Order

$S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is the greatest lower bound on $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(q)$ by definition. Then by Theorem 1, establishing $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$, we have

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \leq S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(q) \qquad \forall q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}).$$

Recently Erven and Harremoes suggested that a better lower bound on $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(q)$ should hold, [24, Conjecture 1]. Erven and Harremoes proved their claim for $\alpha = \infty$ case assuming $\mathcal{Y}$ countable, [24, Theorem 37]. Lemma 16 establishes Erven-Harremoes bound for any positive order α and $\mathcal{W}$ satisfying $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$, using Theorem 1. A constrained generalization of Lemma 16, i.e. Lemma 22, can be found in Appendix F.

Lemma 16. *Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space and $\mathcal{W}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$. If $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$ for an $\alpha \in (0,\infty]$ then*

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} + D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \| \, q) \leq \sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} D_\alpha(w \| \, q) \qquad \forall q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}). \tag{69}$$

Since $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(q) = \sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} D_\alpha(w \| \, q)$ by definition, as surmised by Erven and Harremoes in [24], Lemma 16 quantifies how loose $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(q)$ is as an upper bound to $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$.

Proof of Lemma 16: As a result of equations (33) and (34) we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\tilde{p}\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})} D_\alpha(\tilde{p}\circ\mathcal{W} \| \, \tilde{p}\otimes q) &\geq D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W} \| \, p\otimes q) \qquad && \forall p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}) \\ &= I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) + D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,p} \| \, q) \qquad && \forall p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}). \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

Let $\{p^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ be a sequence of elements of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ such that $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\big(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}\big) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. Then the sequence $\{q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ is a Cauchy sequence with the unique limit point $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ by Theorem 1. Since $\{q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\} \to q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ in total variation topology, same convergence holds in the topology of setwise convergence. On the other hand, the order α Renyi divergence is lower semicontinuous for the topology of setwise convergence by Lemma 7. Thus we have

$$\liminf_{\imath\to\infty} \left[I_\alpha\Big(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}\Big) + D_\alpha\Big(q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}} \Big\| \, q\Big)\right] \geq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} + D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \| \, q)\,. \tag{71}$$

Then (69) follows from (53), (54), (70), and (71). ■

Erven-Harremoes bound allows us to use the continuity of $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ in α and Pinsker-Vajda inequality to establish the continuity of $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ in α for the total variation topology on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$.

Lemma 17. *For any measurable space $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, and $z \in (0,\infty]$.*

$$D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \| \, q_{\phi,\mathcal{W}}) \leq C_{\phi,\mathcal{W}} - C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \qquad \forall \alpha,\phi \text{ such that } 0<\alpha<\phi\leq z. \tag{72}$$

Furthermore, $q_{\cdot,\mathcal{W}} : (0,z] \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ is a continuous function for the total variation topology on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$.

Proof of Lemma 17: If we apply Erven-Harremoes bound, i.e. Lemma 16, for $q = q_{\phi,\mathcal{W}}$ we get,

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} + D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \| \, q_{\phi,\mathcal{W}}) \leq \sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} D_\alpha(w \| \, q_{\phi,\mathcal{W}})\,. \tag{73}$$

Note that $D_\alpha(w \| \, q_{\phi,\mathcal{W}})$ is increasing in α for all $w \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ by Lemma 9-(a). Thus,

$$D_\alpha(w \| \, q_{\phi,\mathcal{W}}) \leq D_\phi(w \| \, q_{\phi,\mathcal{W}}) \qquad \forall w \in \mathcal{W},\ \phi \in [\alpha,z]. \tag{74}$$

On the other hand by equation (59) of Theorem 1 we have

$$\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} D_\phi(w \| \, q_{\phi,\mathcal{W}}) = C_{\phi,\mathcal{W}} \qquad \forall \phi \in (0,z]. \tag{75}$$

Equation (72) follows from (73), (74) and (75).

Using Pinsker's inequality, i.e. equation (30) of Lemma 9-(h), together with equation (72) we get

$$\|q_{\phi,\mathcal{W}} - q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}\| \leq 4(\tfrac{1-\phi}{\phi} \vee 1)(C_{\phi,\mathcal{W}} - C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}). \tag{76}$$

Then the continuity $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ in α for the total variation topology on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ follows from the continuity $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ in α on $(0,z]$, i.e. Lemma 11-(f). ■

In order to prove a similar continuity result in [5], Augustin uses the inequality given below, instead of Erven-Harremoes bound and (72). It can be derived using Theorem 1, the definition of the Renyi information given in (18), alternative expression for the Renyi divergence given in (25) and the fact that $\mu_{\phi,p}$ is an increasing function of order ϕ, i.e. Lemma 3-(b).

$$D_\phi(q_{\alpha,p} \| \, q_{\phi,\mathcal{W}}) \leq C_{\phi,\mathcal{W}} - \tfrac{\phi}{\phi-1}\ln\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\| \qquad \begin{cases} \forall p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}), \forall\alpha\in[\phi,z] & \text{if } \phi<1 \\ \forall p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}), \forall\alpha\in(0,\phi] & \text{if } \phi>1 \end{cases}.$$

Lemma 16 established the continuity of $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ in α for the total variation topology on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$. We suspect a much stronger statement is true. We make a brief digression to motivate and present that statement in the rest of this subsection.

For certain $\mathcal{W}$'s, such as $\mathcal{W}^{(2)}$ of Example 1, $\mathcal{W}^{[f]}$ of Example 4, and $\mathcal{W}^{[\mathcal{F}]}$ of Example 7, $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is the same probability measure for all α's with finite $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. For such a $\mathcal{W}$, the monotonicity of $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ in α, i.e. Lemma 11-(a), and the monotonicity of $\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ in α on $(0,1)$, i.e. Lemma 11-(c), implies for any z with finite $C_{z,\mathcal{W}}$ the following inequality

$$e^{\frac{\phi-1}{\phi}C_{\phi,\mathcal{W}}}\,q_{\phi,\mathcal{W}} \ll e^{\frac{z-1}{z}C_{z,\mathcal{W}}}\,q_{z,\mathcal{W}} \qquad \forall \phi \in (0,z]. \tag{77}$$

If there exists a prior p satisfying $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for all α with finite $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ or if there exists a sequence of priors $\{p^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ satisfying $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\big(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}\big) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for all α with finite $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ then the identity given in (77) holds as a result of the monotonicity $\mu_{\alpha,p}$, i.e. Lemma 3-(b). The closure of the set probability measures described in Example 3 has such a prior and $\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}$ of Example 8 has such a sequence of priors; yet the Renyi centers of both of them change with order.

In addition there are sets of probability measures satisfying the identity given in (77) that do not satisfy any of the hypotheses discussed above. $\Lambda^{[T,a,b]}$ of Example 10 is such as a set of probability measures whenever $a = 0$. (We have confirmed the identity given in (77) numerically for $\Lambda^{[T,a,b]}$ for various values of a and b, as well.)

Conjecture 1. *Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space, $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, and $z \in (0,\infty]$. If $C_{z,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$ then*

$$\mu_{\phi,\mathcal{W}} \ll \mu_{z,\mathcal{W}} \qquad \forall \phi \in (0,z] \tag{78}$$

where $\mu_{\phi,\mathcal{W}} \triangleq e^{\frac{\phi-1}{\alpha}C_{\phi,\mathcal{W}}}\,q_{\phi,\mathcal{W}}$ for all $\phi \in (0,z]$.

For any $\mathcal{W}$ using the continuity of the Renyi center in the order, one can prove that set of all Renyi centers have a reference measure, i.e. $\exists \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ such that $\{q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} : C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} < \infty\} \prec \nu$. However, the continuity of the Renyi center as a function of the order for the total variation topology on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ does not imply the continuity of corresponding Radon-Nikodym derivative $\frac{\mathrm{d}q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}$ as a function of α for ν almost everywhere.[32] If Conjecture 1 is correct then it will imply not only the existence of ν, but also the continuity of Radon-Nikodym derivative $\frac{\mathrm{d}q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}$ as a function of α for ν-almost everywhere.

C. The Renyi Capacity Of Unions, Cartesian Products, Closures, and More

This section is composed of applications of Theorem 1 and Lemma 16. Lemma 18 bounds the Renyi capacity of a union of sets it terms of the Renyi capacities of the sets in the union. Lemma 19 established that the Renyi capacity of a Cartesian product is equal to the sum of the Renyi capacities of its components. Lemma 20 shows that the order α Renyi capacity of the set of elements of $\mathcal{W}$ satisfying $D_\alpha(w\|\,q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}) \geq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} - \epsilon$ is equal to $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. Lemma 21 establishes the invariance of $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ under the closure and convexification operations on $\mathcal{W}$ and characterizes the relative compactness of $\mathcal{W}$ in terms of its Renyi capacity.

Lemma 18. *Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space, α be a positive order, $\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ such that $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} < \infty$ for each integer $\imath \in [1,\kappa]$ and $\mathcal{W}$ be their union, i.e. $\mathcal{W} = \cup_{\imath=1}^{\kappa}\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}$. Then*

$$\bigvee_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \leq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \leq \ln \sum\nolimits_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}}. \tag{79}$$

Furthermore,

- $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \Leftrightarrow S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}) \leq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \Rightarrow q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}$.
- $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = \ln \sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}} \Leftrightarrow q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \perp q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\jmath)}} \ \ \forall \imath \neq \jmath \Rightarrow q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = \sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} \frac{e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}} q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}}{\sum_{\jmath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\jmath)}}}}$.

By the proof presented in the following, both the lower bound and the associated necessary and sufficient condition for it to be satisfied by equality are valid not only when $\imath$'s are from a finite set of integers but also when they are from an arbitrary index set. The Renyi capacity of $\mathcal{W}^{[\mathcal{F}]}$'s considered in Example 7 and $\Lambda^{[T,a,b]}$'s considered in Example 10 can be calculated by such an extension of Lemma 18, as well.

One might think that $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \perp q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\jmath)}}$ iff $\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)} \perp \mathcal{W}^{(\jmath)}$. This, however, is true only for α's in $[1,\infty]$. For α's in $(0,1)$, $\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)} \perp \mathcal{W}^{(\jmath)}$ is a sufficient condition for $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \perp q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\jmath)}}$, but it is not a necessary condition, see Examples 1 and 2. To the best of our knowledge, Augustin [5] is the first one to point out this subtlety and to present necessary and sufficient conditions for $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = \ln \sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}}$. Equation (79) is well known [30, p 535, exercise 5.17]. We use Erven-Harremoes bound in order to characterize the necessary and sufficient conditions for $\bigvee_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ and $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = \ln \sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}}$.

Proof of Lemma 18: We analyze the two inequalities in (79) separately.

[32] The continuity in total variation topology does not imply the continuity of the corresponding Radon-Nikodym derivative: Let the output space be the real numbers between -1 and 2, i.e. $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}) = ([-1,2],\mathcal{B}([-1,2]))$, and the Radon-Nikodym derivative of q_α with respect to the Lebesgue measure λ be

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q_\alpha}{\mathrm{d}\lambda} = \mathbb{1}_{\{\sin(\frac{1}{t-\alpha})\leq y\leq \sin(\frac{1}{t-\alpha})+|\alpha-t|\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{0\leq y\leq 1\}}(1-|\alpha-t|)$$

for a real number t in $(0,1)$. Evidently $\lim_{z\to\alpha}\|q_\alpha - q_z\| = 0$ for all $\alpha \in (0,1)$. But Radon-Nikodym derivative $\frac{\mathrm{d}q_\alpha}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}$ is not continuous as a function of α for any $y \in (0,1)$ at $\alpha = t$.

- $\bigvee_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \leq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$: Note that $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \leq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ by definition. Thus $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ bounded from below by $\bigvee_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}$.
  - If $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ then $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}$ because if $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \neq q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}$ then by using Theorem 1 for (a), Lemma 16 for (b) and Lemma 9-(g) for (c) we get

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \overset{(a)}{\geq} S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}(q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}) \qquad \overset{(b)}{\geq} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} + D_{\alpha}\big(q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \big\| q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}\big) \qquad \overset{(c)}{>} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}.$$

    If $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ and $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}$ then $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}) \leq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}$ by Theorem 1.
  - If $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}) \leq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}$ then $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \leq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}$ by Lemma 13. Hence, $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}$.
- $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \leq \ln \sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}}$: Let μ be $\mu = \bigvee_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}} q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}$ Then using Lemma 9-(b) and Theorem 1 we get

$$S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}(\tfrac{\mu}{\|\mu\|}) = S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}(\mu) + \ln \|\mu\| \qquad \leq S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}(q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}) - \ln e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}} + \ln \|\mu\| \qquad = \ln \|\mu\|. \tag{80}$$

  Then $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \leq \ln \sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}}$ follows from Lemma 13 and the fact that $\|\mu\| \leq \sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}}$.
  - If $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}$ and $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\jmath)}}$ are non-singular for some $\imath \neq \jmath$ then $\|\mu\| < \sum_{\jmath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}}$. Thus $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} < \ln \sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}}$ by equation (80) and Lemma 13. Consequently, if $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = \ln \sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}}$ then $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \perp q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\jmath)}}$ for all $\imath \neq \jmath$.
  - If $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \perp q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\jmath)}}$ for all $\imath \neq \jmath$ then any $s \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ can be written as $s = \sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa+1} s_{\imath}$ where $s_{\imath}$ are finite measures such that $s_{\imath} \prec q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}$ for $\imath \in \{1,\ldots,\kappa\}$ and $s_{\kappa+1} \perp (\sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}})$ by the Lebesgue decomposition theorem [23, 5.5.3]. Using Lemma 16, the alternative expression for the Renyi divergence given in (25) and the monotonicity of the Renyi divergence in the underlying σ-algebra, i.e. Lemma 9-(f), we get

$$S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}(s) \geq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} + D_{\alpha}\big(q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \big\| s\big) \qquad = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} + D_{\alpha}\big(q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \big\| s_{\imath}\big) \qquad \geq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} - \ln \|s_{\imath}\|$$

    Note that $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(s) = \bigvee_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}(s)$. Then using $\sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} \|s_{\imath}\| \leq \|s\| = 1$ we get,

$$S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(s) \geq \bigvee_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} \ln \tfrac{e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}}}{\|s_{\imath}\|} \qquad \geq \ln \tfrac{\sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}}}{\sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} \|s_{\imath}\|} \qquad \geq \ln \sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}} \qquad \forall s \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}).$$

    Then $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \geq \ln \sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}}$. Hence, $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = \ln \sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}}$ because of Theorem 1 and (79).
    When $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}} \perp q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\jmath)}}$ for all $\imath \neq \jmath$ then $\mu = \sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}} q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}$

$$S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}(\tfrac{\mu}{\|\mu\|}) = \ln \sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}}. \qquad \forall \imath$$

    Thus $\frac{\mu}{\|\mu\|}$ is the unique order α Renyi center of $\mathcal{W}$ by Theorem 1.

■

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a finite set. For each $t \in \mathcal{T}$, let $(\mathcal{Y}_t,\mathcal{Y}_t)$ be a measurable space and w_t be a probability measure on $(\mathcal{Y}_t,\mathcal{Y}_t)$. Then there exists a unique product measure $\prod_{t\in\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes} w_t$ on the measurable space $(\prod_{t\in\mathcal{T}}^{\times}\mathcal{Y}_t, \prod_{t\in\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes}\mathcal{Y}_t)$ by [23, Theorem 8.2.2].[33] Let $\mathcal{W}_t$ be a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}_t,\mathcal{Y}_t)$ for each $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Then using the existence and the uniqueness of the product measures we can map the Cartesian product of the sets $\mathcal{W}_t$ uniquely to a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\prod_{t\in\mathcal{T}}^{\times}\mathcal{Y}_t, \prod_{t\in\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes}\mathcal{Y}_t)$, called the product of $\mathcal{W}_t$'s. The Renyi capacity of the product is equal to the sum of the Renyi capacities of the components, see [28, Theorem 5], [30, p149-150, eq 5.6.59], [4, Lemma 3.6],[5, Lemma 26.7a]. Lemma 19 states this fact.

Lemma 19. *Let $(\mathcal{Y}_t,\mathcal{Y}_t)$ be a measurable space and $\mathcal{W}_t$ be a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}_t,\mathcal{Y}_t)$ for each $t \in \mathcal{T}$ where $\mathcal{T}$ is a finite index set. If $\mathcal{Y} = \prod_{t\in\mathcal{T}}^{\times}\mathcal{Y}_t$, $\mathcal{Y} = \prod_{t\in\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes}\mathcal{Y}_t$, and $\mathcal{W} = \Big\{w : w = \prod_{t\in\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes} w_t : w_t \in \mathcal{W}_t\Big\}$ then*

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = \sum\nolimits_{t\in\mathcal{T}} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_t} \qquad \forall \alpha \in (0,\infty]. \tag{81}$$

Furthermore, if $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$ for an $\alpha \in (0,\infty]$ then $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = \prod_{t\in\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes} q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_t}$.

Proof of Lemma 19: By the definition of $I_{\alpha}(p;\mathcal{W})$ for all p satisfying $p = \prod_{t\in\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes} p_t$ for some $p_t \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}_t)$ we have

$$I_{\alpha}(p;\mathcal{W}) = \sum\nolimits_{t\in\mathcal{T}} I_{\alpha}(p_t;\mathcal{W}_t) \qquad \forall \alpha \in [0,\infty]. \tag{82}$$

Furthermore, $\{p : p = \prod_{t\in\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes} p_t, p_t \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}_t), \forall t \in \mathcal{T}\} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} &\geq \sup_{p_1,p_2,\ldots,p_{|\mathcal{T}|}} \sum\nolimits_{t\in\mathcal{T}} I_{\alpha}(p_t;\mathcal{W}_t) \\ &= \sum\nolimits_{t\in\mathcal{T}} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_t} \qquad \forall \alpha \in [0,\infty]. \end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

[33] The existence and the uniqueness of product measures are guaranteed for any finite collection of σ-finite measures by [23, Theorem 4.4.4] and for any countable collections of probability measures by [23, Theorem 8.2.2].

Let us proceed with proving $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \leq \sum_{t\in\mathcal{T}} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_t}$. If there exists a $t \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_t} = \infty$ then the inequality holds trivially. Else, $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_t} < \infty$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$ and by Theorem 1 there exists a $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_t}$ for each $t \in \mathcal{T}$ such that

$$D_\alpha(w_t \| q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_t}) \leq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_t} \qquad \forall w_t \in \mathcal{W}_t.$$

Recall that all w's in $\mathcal{W}$ can be written as $w = \prod_{t\in\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes} w_t$ for some $w_t \in \mathcal{W}_t$ by the hypothesis. Then for $q = \prod_{t\in\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes} q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_t}$ by the alternative expression for the order α Renyi divergence given in (25) and Tonelli-Fubini theorem [23, 4.4.5] we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha(w\| q) &= \sum\nolimits_{t\in\mathcal{T}} D_\alpha(w_t\| q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_t}) \\ &\leq \sum\nolimits_{t\in\mathcal{T}} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_t} \qquad \forall w \in \mathcal{W}. \end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

Then using Lemma 13 we get

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \leq \sum\nolimits_{t\in\mathcal{T}} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_t}. \tag{85}$$

■

Note that $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} - I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) - D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,p}\| q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}) \geq 0$ as result equation (60). One curious question is that whether or not one can give a class of priors for which this lower bound, is not too loose. Lemma 20 answers this question in the affirmative.

Lemma 20. *For any measurable space $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, $\alpha \in (0,\infty]$ such that $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} < \infty$ and $\epsilon \geq 0$, let $\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}$ be*

$$\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)} \triangleq \{w \in \mathcal{W} : D_\alpha(w\| q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}) \geq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} - \epsilon\}. \tag{86}$$

Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ we have $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ and[34]

$$|C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} - I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) - D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,p}\| q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}})| \leq \epsilon \qquad \forall p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}). \tag{87}$$

Furthermore, if $\mathcal{W}$ is a finite set then $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,0)}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ and (87) holds for $\epsilon = 0$.

Finiteness of $\mathcal{W}$ is not a superficial hypothesis for extending the claims to $\epsilon = 0$ case. See Example 3 for a $\mathcal{W}$ for which $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} > 0$ and $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,0)}} = 0$.

Proof of Lemma 20: The alternative expression for the Renyi divergence given in (25) implies that

$$\inf\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} D_\alpha(w\| q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}) \leq D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\| p\otimes q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}) \leq \sup\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} D_\alpha(w\| q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}).$$

On the other hand, by equations (33) and (34) we have

$$D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\| p\otimes q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}) = I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) + D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,p}\| q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}).$$

Then equation (87) follows from the definition of $\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}$ and Theorem 1.

Note that $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} \leq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ by definition. In the following we prove by contradiction that $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$.

- $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} \neq q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ and $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} < C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$: Let $q = (1-e^{-\epsilon/2}) q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} + e^{-\epsilon/2} q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. Then by Lemma 9-(b)

$$\sup\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{W}\setminus\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} D_\alpha(w\| q) \leq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} - \epsilon/2 \tag{88}$$

By the convexity of the Renyi divergence in its second argument, i.e. Lemma 9-(d) and Theorem 1 we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} D_\alpha(w\| q) &\leq \sup\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} \left[(1-e^{-\epsilon/2}) D_\alpha\big(w\| q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}}\big) + e^{-\epsilon/2} D_\alpha(w\| q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}})\right] \\ &\leq (1-e^{-\epsilon/2}) \sup\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} D_\alpha\big(w\| q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}}\big) + e^{-\epsilon/2} \sup\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} D_\alpha(w\| q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}) \\ &= (1-e^{-\epsilon/2}) C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} + e^{-\epsilon/2} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \\ &< C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

Using equations (88) and (89) we get $\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} D_\alpha(w\| q) < C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. This is a contradiction by Theorem 1.

- $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} = q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ and $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} < C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$: By the definition of $\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}$ and Theorem 1 we have $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$.

Since $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$, using Lemma 16 we get

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} + D_\alpha\big(q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}}\big\| q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}\big) \leq \sup\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} D_\alpha(w\| q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}).$$

Thus $D_\alpha\big(q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}}\big\| q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}\big) = 0$ as a result of definition of $\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}$. Then $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} = q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ by Lemma 9-(g).

As a result of the definition of $\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}$, an element of $\mathcal{W}$ is in $\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,0)}$ iff it is in $\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}$ for all $\epsilon > 0$, i.e. $\bigcap_{\epsilon>0} \mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)} = \mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,0)}$. Consequently if $\mathcal{W}$ is a finite set then $\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)} = \mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,0)}$ for[35] small enough ϵ. Then $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,0)}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. Furthermore equation (87) holds for $\epsilon = 0$ because (87) holds for all $\epsilon > 0$. ■

[34]For $\alpha = \infty$, equation (87) is valid for a broader class of p's in particular for all p's such that $(\sum_{w\in\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}} p(w)) > 0$.

[35]When we consider arbitrary $\mathcal{W}$'s, identity $\bigcap_{\epsilon>0} \mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)} = \mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,0)}$ does not imply that $\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)} = \mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,0)}$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. $\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,0)}$ can be empty set or a non-empty set such that $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,0)}} < C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$, see Example 3.

Theorem 1, when considered together with the lower semicontinuity and the quasiconvexity of the Renyi divergence in its first argument, i.e. Lemma 7 and Lemma 9-(e), implies the invariance of $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ under the closure and the convexification operations on $\mathcal{W}$. Furthermore, when considered together with de la Vallee Poussin theorem [7, 4.5.9], Theorem 1 implies that if $C_{z,\mathcal{W}}$ is finite for a z in $[1,\infty]$ then $\mathcal{W}\prec^{uni} q_{z,\mathcal{W}}$. What is less obvious and more interesting is that $\lim_{\alpha\uparrow 1}\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}=0$ iff there exists a $\mu\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ such that $\mathcal{W}\prec^{uni}\mu$. This characterization of uniform absolute continuity is important because $\mathcal{W}$ is relatively compact, i.e. has a compact closure, in the topology of setwise convergence iff there exists a $\mu\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ such that $\mathcal{W}\prec^{uni}\mu$ by a version of Dunford-Pettis theorem [7, 4.7.25]. Since topology of set wise convergence and the weak topology[36] have exactly the same family of sets as their compact sets, [7, Theorem 4.7.25], uniform absolute continuity also characterizes the relative compactness in the weak topology.

Lemma 21. *Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space and $\mathcal{W}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$.*

(a) $C_{\alpha,\mathtt{ch}\mathcal{W}}=C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for all $\alpha\in(0,\infty]$ where $\mathtt{ch}\mathcal{W}$ is the convex hull of $\mathcal{W}$ given by $\mathtt{ch}\mathcal{W}\triangleq\{\mu_{1,p}:p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})\}$.

(b) $C_{\alpha,\mathtt{cl}\mathcal{W}}=C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for all $\alpha\in(0,\infty]$ where $\mathtt{cl}\mathcal{W}$ is the closure of $\mathcal{W}$ in the topology of setwise convergence or a stronger topology on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$.

(c) If $C_{z,\mathcal{W}}<\infty$ for a $z\in(1,\infty]$ then $\{\mu_{\alpha,p}:\alpha\in[0,z],p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})\}$ is uniformly absolutely continues with respect to $q_{z,\mathcal{W}}$ and relatively compact in both topology of setwise convergence and the weak topology.

(d) Following four statements are equivalent:

(i) $\lim_{\alpha\uparrow 1}\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}=0$.

(ii) $\exists\mu\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ such that $\mathcal{W}\prec^{uni}\mu$.

(iii) $\mathcal{W}$ has compact closure in the topology of setwise convergence.

(iv) $\mathcal{W}$ has compact closure in the weak topology.

Proof of Lemma 21:

(21-a) $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})\subset\mathcal{P}(\mathtt{ch}\mathcal{W})$ because $\mathcal{W}\subset\mathtt{ch}\mathcal{W}$; hence $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}\le C_{\alpha,\mathtt{ch}\mathcal{W}}$ by definition. If $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}=\infty$ then $C_{\alpha,\mathtt{ch}\mathcal{W}}\le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ holds trivially. If $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}<\infty$ then $\exists! q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ satisfying $\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}}D_\alpha(w\|\,q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}})=C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ by Theorem 1. Then as a result of the quasi-convexity of the Renyi divergence in its first argument, i.e. Lemma 9-(e), we have

$$D_\alpha(\mu_{1,p}\|\,q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}})\le\bigvee\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p}D_\alpha(w\|\,q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}})\qquad\le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}\qquad\forall p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}).$$

Consequently, $C_{\alpha,\mathtt{ch}\mathcal{W}}\le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ by Lemma 13.

(21-b) $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})\subset\mathcal{P}(\mathtt{cl}\mathcal{W})$ because $\mathcal{W}\subset\mathtt{cl}\mathcal{W}$; hence $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}\le C_{\alpha,\mathtt{cl}\mathcal{W}}$ by definition. If $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}=\infty$ then $C_{\alpha,\mathtt{cl}\mathcal{W}}\le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ holds trivially. If $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}<\infty$ then $\exists! q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ satisfying $\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}}D_\alpha(w\|\,q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}})=C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ by Theorem 1. Then by the lower semicontinuity of the Renyi divergence in its first argument, i.e. Lemma 7, for all $v\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ and $\epsilon>0$, there exists an open set $\mathcal{N}$ containing v, i.e. a neighborhood of v, such that

$$D_\alpha(v\|\,q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}})-\epsilon<D_\alpha(s\|\,q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}})\qquad\forall s\in\mathcal{N}.$$

If $v\in\mathtt{cl}\mathcal{W}$ then every open set containing v contains a member of $\mathcal{W}$. Thus $D_\alpha(v\|\,q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}})-\epsilon<C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ by Theorem 1 for every $v\in\mathtt{cl}\mathcal{W}$ and $\epsilon>0$. Then[37] $D_\alpha(v\|\,q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}})\le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for every $v\in\mathtt{cl}\mathcal{W}$ and $C_{\alpha,\mathtt{cl}\mathcal{W}}\le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ by Lemma 13. Closure of $\mathcal{W}$ for a topology stronger than topology of setwise convergence is a subset of closure of $\mathcal{W}$ for the topology of setwise convergence and a superset of $\mathcal{W}$. Thus its Renyi capacity is bounded from below and from above by $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$.

(21-c) If $C_{z,\mathcal{W}}<\infty$ then $\exists! q_{z,\mathcal{W}}$ satisfying $D_z(q_{z,p}\|\,q_{z,\mathcal{W}})\le C_{z,\mathcal{W}}-I_z(p;\mathcal{W})$ for all $p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ by Theorem 1 and (60).

- For $z>1$ case using the definition of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ given in (18) and the alternative expression for the order α Renyi divergence given in (25) we get,

$$\int(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{z,p}}{\mathrm{d}\nu})^z(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q_{z,\mathcal{W}}}{\mathrm{d}\nu})^{1-z}\nu(\mathrm{d}y)\le e^{(z-1)C_{z,\mathcal{W}}}\qquad\forall p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}).$$

[36] The weak topology on $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ is the topology generated by all continuous linear functions from $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ with the total variation topology to $\mathbb{R}$ with its usual topology. Then the weak topology on $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ is weaker than the total variation topology, i.e. the initial topology, on $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$. On the other hand, topology of setwise convergence on $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ is the topology generated by the functions $\{f_\mathcal{E}:\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{Y}\}$ where $f_\mathcal{E}(\mu)=\int_\mathcal{E}\mu(\mathrm{d}y)$ for all $\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{Y}$ and $\mu\in\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$. Since $f_\mathcal{E}:\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})\to\mathbb{R}$ is a continuous linear function for any $\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{Y}$, the weak topology on $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ is stronger than the topology of setwise convergence on $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$. Nevertheless, the weak topology on $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ and the topology of setwise convergence on $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ have exactly the same class of compact sets, [7, Theorem 4.7.25].

Our use of the term weak topology is consistent with the convention used in functional analysis, see [7, p281, p291]. While discussing the convergence of measures, however, the term weak topology is commonly used to describe another topology. If there is a topology on $\mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ is the resulting Baire $\sigma-$algebra [7, p12] of the subset of $\mathcal{Y}$ then one can interpret the space of measures as a space of linear functionals on the space of continuous and bounded functions on $\mathcal{Y}$. The weak* topology on the space of measures in this setting is often called the weak topology [7, Definition 8.1.2]. Although it is a very important and useful concept in general, the weak topology in this second sense is not relevant in our discussion because we have not assumed any topological structure on $\mathcal{Y}$.

[37] In a sense this observation is nothing but the definition of continuity: A function $f:\mathcal{X}\to\mathcal{Z}$ is continuous iff for any $\mathcal{A}\subset\mathcal{X}$, $f(\mathtt{cl}\mathcal{A})\subset\mathtt{cl}f(\mathcal{A})$ by [53, Theorem 18.1]. If we chose $\mathcal{X}$ to be $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ with the topology of setwise convergence, $\mathcal{Z}$ to be $(-\infty,\infty]$ with the topology generated by the sets of the form $(z,\infty]$ for $z\in\mathbb{R}$ and f to be $f(\cdot)=D_\alpha(\cdot\|\,q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}})$, then the lower semicontinuity of the Renyi divergence in its first argument is equivalent to the continuity of f. On the other hand $f(\mathcal{W})\subset(-\infty,C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}]$ by Theorem 1 and $(-\infty,C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}]$ is a closed for the topology we have chosen for $(-\infty,\infty]$. Thus $f(\mathtt{cl}\mathcal{W})\subset\mathtt{cl}f(\mathcal{W})\subset(-\infty,C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}]$, i.e. $D_\alpha(v\|\,q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}})\le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for all $v\in\mathtt{cl}\mathcal{W}$.

Since $C_{z,\mathcal{W}}$ is finite this implies that $\mu_{z,p} \prec q_{z,\mathcal{W}}$. On the other hand by Lemma 3-(a,b) we know that $\mu_{\alpha,p}$ is an increasing function of α in the sense that if $\alpha < z$ then $\mu_{\alpha,p} \ll \mu_{z,p}$. Hence,

$$\int (\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}{\mathrm{d}q_{z,\mathcal{W}}})^z q_{z,\mathcal{W}}(\mathrm{d}y) \leq e^{(z-1)C_{z,\mathcal{W}}} \qquad \forall p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}), \forall \alpha \in [0,z].$$

Then $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}{\mathrm{d}q_{z,\mathcal{W}}}$ are $q_{z,\mathcal{W}}$-integrable functions and the set $\{\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}{\mathrm{d}q_{z,\mathcal{W}}} : p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}),\ \alpha \in [0,z]\}$ satisfies[38] necessary and sufficient condition for the uniform integrability determined by de la Vallee Poussin [7, Theorem 4.5.9], for the growth function $G(x) = x^z$. But when the reference measure is finite, uniform integrability is equivalent to uniform absolute continuity of the integrals and boundedness in $\mathcal{L}_1(q_{z,\mathcal{W}})$ by [7, Theorem 4.5.3], which in our case nothing but uniform absolute continuity with respect to $q_{z,\mathcal{W}}$ and boundedness in total variation norm for the set of all mean measures. Thus

$$\{\mu_{\alpha,p} : p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}),\ \alpha \in [0,z]\} \prec^{uni} q_{z,\mathcal{W}}.$$

On the other hand by [7, Theorem 4.7.25] a set of measures is uniformly absolutely continuous with respect to a finite measure and bounded in variation norm iff it has compact closure in the topology of setwise convergence. A set of measures has compact closure in the topology of setwise convergence iff it has compact closure in the weak topology by [7, Theorem 4.7.25], as well.

- For $z = 1$ case, using the fact that $x \ln x \geq -1/e$, $\|\mu_{1,p}\| = 1$ and the alternative expression for order one Renyi divergence given in (25) we get,

$$\int \left| \tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p}}{\mathrm{d}q_{1,\mathcal{W}}} \ln \tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p}}{\mathrm{d}q_{1,\mathcal{W}}} \right|^+ q_{1,\mathcal{W}}(\mathrm{d}y) \leq C_{1,\mathcal{W}} - I_z(p;\mathcal{W}) + \tfrac{1}{e} \qquad \forall p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$$

where $|x|^+ = x \vee 0$. Since mean measure is an increasing function of the order by Lemma 3-(a,b) and $|x \ln x|^+$ is an increasing function of x. Then we have,

$$\int \left| \tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}{\mathrm{d}q_{1,\mathcal{W}}} \ln \tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}{\mathrm{d}q_{1,\mathcal{W}}} \right|^+ q_{1,\mathcal{W}}(\mathrm{d}y) \leq C_{1,\mathcal{W}} + \tfrac{1}{e} \qquad \forall p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}), \forall \alpha \in [0,1].$$

We use the growth function $G(x) = |x \ln x|^+$ instead of $G(x) = x^z$, the rest of the proof for $z = 1$ case is identical to that of $z > 1$ case.

(21-d) The equivalence of last three statements to one another is a version of Dunford-Pettis theorem [7, 4.7.25]. Thus we will only prove the equivalence of the first two statements.
Let us first prove the direct part: if there exists a $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ such that $\mathcal{W} \prec^{uni} \mu$ then $\lim_{\alpha\uparrow 1} \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = 0$. Note that $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \leq \sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} D_\alpha(w\|\, q)$ for all $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ by Lemma 13. Thus using the alternative expression for the order α Renyi divergence given in (25) we get

$$\limsup_{\alpha\uparrow 1} \tfrac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \leq -\ln \liminf_{\alpha\uparrow 1} \inf_{w\in\mathcal{W}} \int (\tfrac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\mu})^\alpha \mu(\mathrm{d}y). \tag{90}$$

Since $\mathcal{W} \prec^{uni} \mu$ then for all $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta_\epsilon > 0$ such that if $\mu(\mathcal{E}) \leq \delta_\epsilon$ for a $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{Y}$ then $w(\mathcal{E}) \leq \epsilon$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$. On the other hand $\mu(\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\mu} > \frac{1}{\delta_\epsilon}) \leq \delta_\epsilon$ by Markov inequality. Hence $w(\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\mu} > \frac{1}{\delta_\epsilon}) \leq \epsilon$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\int (\tfrac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\mu})^\alpha \mu(\mathrm{d}y) &\geq \int (\tfrac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\mu})^{\alpha-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\mu} \in (0, \frac{1}{\delta_\epsilon}]\}} w(\mathrm{d}y) \\
&\geq (\tfrac{1}{\delta_\epsilon})^{\alpha-1} w(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\mu} \in (0, \tfrac{1}{\delta_\epsilon}]) \\
&= \delta_\epsilon^{1-\alpha}(1 - w(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\mu} > \tfrac{1}{\delta_\epsilon})) \\
&\geq \delta_\epsilon^{1-\alpha}(1-\epsilon) \qquad \forall w \in \mathcal{W}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus for any $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$\liminf_{\alpha\uparrow 1} \inf_{w\in\mathcal{W}} \int (\tfrac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\mu})^\alpha \mu(\mathrm{d}y) \geq (1-\epsilon).$$

Then using (90) and the fact that $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \geq 0$ we can conclude that

$$\lim_{\alpha\uparrow 1} \tfrac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} = 0.$$

[38] A set of $q_{z,\mathcal{W}}$-integrable functions is uniformly integrable iff it has compact closure in the weak topology of $\mathcal{L}_1(q_{z,\mathcal{W}})$ by Dunford-Pettis theorem [7, 4.7.18]. Thus $\{\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}{\mathrm{d}q_{z,\mathcal{W}}} : p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}),\ \alpha \in [0,z]\}$ has compact closure in the weak topology of $\mathcal{L}_1(q_{z,\mathcal{W}})$. Since we have chosen to work with the space of measures rather than the space of integrable functions we have stated our result in terms of relative compactness in the space of measures rather than integrable functions.

Now we are left with proving the converse statement: if $\lim_{\alpha\uparrow 1}\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}=0$ then there exists a $\mu\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ such that $\mathcal{W}\prec^{uni}\mu$. We start with proving the following statement about the Renyi centers: For every $\epsilon>0$ there exists a $\alpha_\epsilon\in(0,1)$ and a $z_\epsilon\in(0,\epsilon)$ such that if $q_{\alpha_\epsilon,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{E})\leq z_\epsilon$ then $w(\mathcal{E})<\epsilon$ for all $w\in\mathcal{W}$.
For any $\epsilon>0$ there exists a $\alpha_\epsilon\in(0,1)$ such that $e^{\frac{\alpha_\epsilon-1}{\alpha_\epsilon}C_{\alpha_\epsilon,\mathcal{W}}}>1-\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ because $\lim_{\alpha\uparrow 1}\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}=0$. On the other hand, $D_\alpha^{\{\mathcal{E},\mathcal{Y}\setminus\mathcal{E}\}}(w\|\,q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}})\leq C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for any $w\in\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{Y}$, as a result of Theorem 1 and the definition of the Renyi divergence given in (22). Then α_ϵ described above satisfies

$$(w(\mathcal{E}))^{\alpha_\epsilon}(q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{E}))^{1-\alpha_\epsilon}+(1-w(\mathcal{E}))^{\alpha_\epsilon}(1-q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{E}))^{1-\alpha_\epsilon}\geq(1-\tfrac{\epsilon}{2})^{\alpha_\epsilon}\qquad\forall\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{Y},w\in\mathcal{W}.\tag{91}$$

Given $\epsilon\in(0,0.5)$ and corresponding $\alpha_\epsilon\in(0,1)$ let the function $f_\epsilon:[0,1]\times[0,1]\to[0,1]$ be

$$f_\epsilon(x,z)=x^{\alpha_\epsilon}z^{1-\alpha_\epsilon}+(1-x)^{\alpha_\epsilon}(1-z)^{1-\alpha_\epsilon}$$

$f_\epsilon(\cdot,z)$ and $f_\epsilon(x,\cdot)$ are concave functions and $f_\epsilon(t,t)=1$ for all $t\in[0,1]$. Furthermore, $f_\epsilon(x,z)$ is strictly increasing in z on $[0,x]$ for any $x\in(0,1)$ and $f_\epsilon(x,z)$ is strictly decreasing in x on $[z,1]$ for any $z\in(0,1)$. Since $f_\epsilon(\epsilon,0)=(1-\epsilon)^{\alpha_\epsilon}$, $f_\epsilon(\epsilon,\epsilon)=1$, $f_\epsilon(\epsilon,1)=\epsilon^{\alpha_\epsilon}$ and $f_\epsilon(\epsilon,\cdot)$ is concave, the equation $f_\epsilon(\epsilon,z)=(1-\epsilon/2)^{\alpha_\epsilon}$ has two solutions one less than ϵ called z_ϵ and another one larger than ϵ. Furthermore $f_\epsilon(x,z)<f_\epsilon(\epsilon,z_\epsilon)=(1-\epsilon/2)^{\alpha_\epsilon}$. for any $z\in[0,z_\epsilon)$ and $x\in[\epsilon,1]$. Hence, using equation (91) we can conclude that if $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{E})<z_\epsilon$ for a $\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{Y}$ then $w(\mathcal{E})<\epsilon$ for all $w\in\mathcal{W}$ where z_ϵ is the smaller one of the two solutions of $f_\epsilon(\epsilon,z)=(1-\frac{\epsilon}{2})^{\alpha_\epsilon}$ for z.
Now we use the this feature of the Renyi centers to prove construct a μ such that $\mathcal{W}\prec^{uni}\mu$. Let μ be $\sum_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}2^{-\imath}q_{\alpha_{e^{-\imath}},\mathcal{W}}$. For any $\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{Y}$ and $\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+$, if $\mu(\mathcal{E})\leq 2^{-\imath}z_{e^{-\imath}}$ then $q_{\alpha_{e^{-\imath}},\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{E})\leq z_{e^{-\imath}}$ and $w(\mathcal{E})\leq e^{-\imath}$ for all $w\in\mathcal{W}$. Thus for any $\epsilon>0$ if $\mu(\mathcal{E})\leq 2^{-\kappa(\epsilon)}z_{e^{-\kappa(\epsilon)}}$ then $w(\mathcal{E})<\epsilon$ where $\kappa(\epsilon)=\lceil\ln 1/\epsilon\rceil$. Consequently $\mathcal{W}\prec^{uni}\mu$.

■

V. Examples

A. Certain Families of Probability Measures on Discrete Output Spaces

Let us first demonstrate that two sets of probability measures $\mathcal{W}^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{W}^{(2)}$ that are not singular with one another can have Renyi centers that are singular with one another.

Example 1 (Nonsingular Sets Of Probability Measures with Singular Renyi Centers:Finite $\mathcal{Y}$)**.** For an $\delta\in(0,\frac{1}{5})$, let $\mathcal{W}^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{W}^{(2)}$ be[39]

$$\mathcal{W}^{(1)}=\begin{bmatrix}1-\delta & \delta & 0 & 0\\ \delta & 1-\delta & 0 & 0\\ \frac{1-\delta}{2} & \frac{1-\delta}{2} & \frac{\delta}{2} & \frac{\delta}{2}\end{bmatrix}\qquad\qquad\mathcal{W}^{(2)}=\begin{bmatrix}0 & 0 & 1-\delta & \delta\\ 0 & 0 & \delta & 1-\delta\end{bmatrix}$$

The third member of $\mathcal{W}^{(1)}$ is not singular with the members of $\mathcal{W}^{(2)}$; thus $\mathcal{W}^{(1)}$ is not singular with $\mathcal{W}^{(2)}$. We show in the following that $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(1)}}\perp q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(2)}}$ for all $\alpha\in(0,f^{-1}(\frac{\delta}{1-\delta})]$ where $f^{-1}:[0,\frac{1}{4}]\to[0,1]$ is the inverse of the bijective decreasing function $f(x)=(2^{1-x}-1)^{\frac{1}{x}}$.

For $\mathcal{W}^{(2)}$ let us consider the prior p that divides its probability mass equally between the two members of $\mathcal{W}^{(2)}$. Then

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(2)}}\geq I_\alpha\Big(p;\mathcal{W}^{(2)}\Big)=\ln 2-h_\alpha(\delta)\qquad\text{where}\qquad h_\alpha(\delta)=\begin{cases}\frac{1}{1-\alpha}\ln(\delta^\alpha+(1-\delta)^\alpha) & \alpha\neq 1\\ \delta\ln\frac{1}{\delta}+(1-\delta)\ln\frac{1}{1-\delta} & \alpha=1\end{cases}.$$

Furthermore, $q_{\alpha,p}=\begin{bmatrix}0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2}\end{bmatrix}$ and $D_\alpha(w\|\,q_{\alpha,p})=\ln 2-h_\alpha(\delta)$ for both members of $\mathcal{W}^{(2)}$. Thus by Lemma 13 we have,

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(2)}}\leq\ln 2-h_\alpha(\delta).$$

Consequently $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(2)}}=\ln 2-h_\alpha(\delta)$ and $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(2)}}=\begin{bmatrix}0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2}\end{bmatrix}$ by Lemma 14.

For $\mathcal{W}^{(1)}$ let us consider the prior $\widetilde{p}$ that divides its probability mass equally between the first two members of $\mathcal{W}^{(1)}$. Then

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(1)}}\geq I_\alpha\Big(\widetilde{p};\mathcal{W}^{(1)}\Big)=\ln 2-h_\alpha(\delta)\qquad\qquad q_{\alpha,\widetilde{p}}=\begin{bmatrix}\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0\end{bmatrix}.$$

For the first two members of $\mathcal{W}^{(1)}$ we have $D_\alpha(w\|\,q_{\alpha,\widetilde{p}})=\ln 2-h_\alpha(\delta)$. For the third member of $\mathcal{W}^{(1)}$ if $\alpha\leq f^{-1}(\frac{\delta}{1-\delta})$. then $D_\alpha(w\|\,q_{\alpha,\widetilde{p}})\leq\ln 2-h_\alpha(\delta)$. Thus by Lemma 13 we have,

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(1)}}\leq\ln 2-h_\alpha(\delta)\qquad\qquad\forall\alpha\in(0,f^{-1}(\tfrac{\delta}{1-\delta})].$$

Consequently $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(1)}}=\ln 2-h_\alpha(\delta)$ and $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(1)}}=\begin{bmatrix}\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0\end{bmatrix}$ for all $\alpha\in(0,f^{-1}(\frac{\delta}{1-\delta})]$ by Lemma 14.

[39] When both $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are finite sets and $\mathcal{Y}=2^{\mathcal{Y}}$, it is customary to describe $\mathcal{W}$ using a matrix. Each row corresponds to an element of $\mathcal{W}$, each column corresponds to an element of $\mathcal{Y}$ and the element on row w and column y is equal to $w(y)$. With a slight abuse of notation we denote the resulting matrix by $\mathcal{W}$.

Example 2 (Nonsingular Sets Of Probability Measures with Singular Renyi Centers: Countable $\mathcal{Y}$)**.** Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be $(\mathbb{Z},2^{\mathbb{Z}})$. For any $\delta\in[0,1]$ and $\imath,\jmath\in\mathbb{Z}$, let $w^{\delta,\imath,\jmath}\in\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z},2^{\mathbb{Z}})$ be

$$w^{\delta,\imath,\jmath}(y)=\mathbb{1}_{\{y=\imath\}}(1-\delta)+\mathbb{1}_{\{y=\jmath\}}\delta.$$

For each integer $\imath$ let $\delta_\imath$ be a real number in $(0,1)$ and let $\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}$ be

$$\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}=\{w^{\delta_\imath,\imath,\jmath}:\jmath\in\mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Then for any $\alpha\in(0,1)$ and sequence $\{p^{(\kappa)}\}$ of uniform distributions with strictly increasing support $q_{\alpha,p^{(\kappa)}}\to\mathbb{1}_{\{y=\imath\}}$ in the total variation topology and $\lim_{\kappa\to\infty}I_\alpha\big(p^{(\kappa)};\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}\big)=\frac{\alpha\ln(1-\delta_\imath)}{\alpha-1}$. Furthermore, $D_\alpha(w\|\,q)\le\frac{\alpha\ln(1-\delta_\imath)}{\alpha-1}$ for all $w\in\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}$ and $\alpha\in(0,1)$ for $q(\cdot)=\mathbb{1}_{\{\cdot=\imath\}}$. Thus $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}=\frac{\alpha\ln(1-\delta_\imath)}{\alpha-1}$ and $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}(\cdot)=\mathbb{1}_{\{\cdot=\imath\}}$ by Theorem 1 for $\alpha\in(0,1)$.

Although $\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}$'s are not singular with one another,[40] $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}}\perp q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\jmath)}}$ for all $\alpha\in(0,1)$ whenever $\imath\neq\imath$. Thus we can use Lemma 18 to calculate the Renyi capacity of any finite union of $\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}$'s. For any finite set of integers $\mathcal{A}$ let $\mathcal{W}^{(\mathcal{A})}$ be

$$\mathcal{W}^{(\mathcal{A})}=\cup_{\imath\in\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}\qquad\text{then}\qquad C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{(\mathcal{A})}}=\ln\Big[\sum\nolimits_{\imath\in\mathcal{A}}(1-\delta_\imath)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}\Big].$$

For $\mathcal{W}$'s that are infinite sets, Lemma 20 restricts its claims about $\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,\epsilon)}$ to positive values of ϵ. If $\mathcal{W}$ is an infinite set, $\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,0)}$ can be the empty set or a non-empty set whose order α Renyi capacity is strictly smaller than that of $\mathcal{W}$. Following example presents a $\mathcal{W}$ for which $\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,0)}=\emptyset$.

Example 3 (Erasure Channel)**.** Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be $(\mathbb{Z},2^{\mathbb{Z}})$. For any $\delta\in[0,1]$ and $\jmath\in\mathbb{Z}$, let $w^{\delta,\jmath}\in\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z},2^{\mathbb{Z}})$ be

$$w^{\delta,\jmath}(y)=\mathbb{1}_{\{y=\jmath\}}(1-\delta)+\mathbb{1}_{\{y=0\}}\delta.$$

Let n be a positive integer and $\mathcal{W}$ be

$$\mathcal{W}=\{w^{\delta,\jmath}:\jmath\in\{1,\dots,n\},\delta\in(\varrho,1]\}.$$

Let $\delta^{(\imath)}$ be a sequence such that $\delta^{(\imath)}\downarrow\varrho$. For each $\imath$ let $p^{(\imath)}$ be the probability measure that puts equal probability mass on $w^{\delta^{(\imath)},\jmath}$ for $\jmath\in\{1,\dots,n\}$. Then

$$I_\alpha\Big(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}\Big)=\begin{cases}\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\ln\Big[\delta^{(\imath)}+(1-\delta^{(\imath)})n^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}\Big] & \alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\}\\ (1-\delta^{(\imath)})\ln n & \alpha=1\end{cases}.\tag{92}$$

Furthermore, $q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\to s_\alpha$ in the total variation topology where

$$s_\alpha=\frac{\varrho}{\varrho+(1-\varrho)n^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}}\mathbb{1}_{\{y=0\}}+\frac{(1-\varrho)n^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}}{\varrho+(1-\varrho)n^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}}\sum\nolimits_{\jmath=1}^{n}\mathbb{1}_{\{y=\jmath\}}.$$

On the other hand for any $\jmath\in\{1,\dots,n\}$

$$D_\alpha\big(w^{\delta,\jmath}\big\|\,s_\alpha\big)=\begin{cases}\ln\Big[\varrho+(1-\varrho)n^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}\Big]+\frac{1}{\alpha-1}\ln\Big[\delta^\alpha\varrho^{1-\alpha}+(1-\delta)^\alpha(1-\varrho)^{1-\alpha}n^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}\Big] & \alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\}\\ \delta\ln\frac{\delta}{\varrho}+(1-\delta)\ln\frac{(1-\delta)n}{1-\varrho} & \alpha=1\end{cases}.$$

Hence for any $\alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+$,

$$D_\alpha(w\|\,s_\alpha)<\begin{cases}\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\ln\Big[\varrho+(1-\varrho)n^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}\Big] & \alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\}\\ (1-\varrho)\ln n & \alpha=1\end{cases}\qquad\forall w\in\mathcal{W}.$$

Thus using Lemma 13 and equation (92) we get,

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}=\begin{cases}\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\ln\Big[\varrho+(1-\varrho)n^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}\Big] & \alpha\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\{1\}\\ (1-\varrho)\ln n & \alpha=1\end{cases}.$$

For any α in $(0,1)$, $\mathcal{W}_{(\alpha,0)}=\emptyset$ because $D_\alpha(w\|\,s_\alpha)<C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for all $w\in\mathcal{W}$. By including one or more of $w^{\varrho,\jmath}$ in $\mathcal{W}$ we can get $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}$'s satisfying $C_{\alpha,\tilde{\mathcal{W}}_{(\alpha,0)}}\in(0,C_{\alpha,\tilde{\mathcal{W}}})$ where $C_{\alpha,\tilde{\mathcal{W}}}=C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$.

[40] When $\delta_\imath=\frac{1}{2}$, $\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}$'s are not only non-singular with one another, but they have nonempty intersection with one another, i.e. $\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}\cap\mathcal{W}^{(\imath)}\neq\emptyset$ for all $\imath,\jmath$.

B. Shift Invariant Families of Probability Measures on The Unit Interval

Agustin [5] considers shift invariant families of probability measures on the unit interval and states equivalent results for all positive orders. But he presents a detailed analysis only for $\alpha = 1$ case, using tools different from ours.

Example 4 (Modular Shifts of a Probability Measure on Unit Interval)**.** Let $\mathcal{Y}$ be $[0,1)$, $\mathcal{Y}$ be $\mathcal{B}([0,1))$, and f be a non-negative Lebesgue measurable function such that $\int f\lambda(\mathrm{d}y) = 1$. Then $\mathcal{W}^{[f]}$ is the set of all probability measures whose Radon-Nikodym derivative is a mod one shift of f:

$$\mathcal{W}^{[f]} \triangleq \left\{ w : \tfrac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\lambda} = f \circ \mathtt{T}_x \text{ for some } x \in [0,1) \right\} \qquad \text{where} \qquad \mathtt{T}_x(y) \triangleq y - x - \lfloor y - x \rfloor. \tag{93}$$

Let[41] us denote the measure whose Radon-Nikodym derivative is f by w_f. Note that $D_\alpha(w \| \lambda) = D_\alpha(w_f \| \lambda)$ for any w in $\mathcal{W}^{[f]}$ and $\alpha \in (0,\infty]$. Thus $\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} D_\alpha(w\|\lambda) = D_\alpha(w_f\|\lambda)$ for any $\alpha \in (0,\infty]$.

For any $\alpha \in (0,\infty]$, by Theorem 1, if $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} = \infty$ then $\inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} \sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} D_\alpha(w\|q) = \infty$. Then $\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} D_\alpha(w\|\lambda)$ and hence $D_\alpha(w_f\|\lambda)$ are infinite. Thus $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} = D_\alpha(w_f\|\lambda)$ holds when $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}}$ is infinite.

For any $\alpha \in (0,\infty]$, by Theorem 1, if $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} < \infty$ then $\exists! q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ such that

$$D_\alpha\big(w\|\, q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}}\big) \le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} \qquad \forall w \in \mathcal{W}^{[f]}.$$

On the other hand $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} = q^\perp + q^\sim$ where $q^\perp \perp \lambda$ and $q^\sim \prec \lambda$, by the Lebesgue decomposition theorem [23, 5.5.3]. Since $w \prec \lambda$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}^{[f]}$ using the alternative expression for Renyi divergence given in (25) we can conclude that $D_\alpha\big(w\|\, q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}}\big) = D_\alpha(w\|\, q^\sim)$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}^{[f]}$. Thus

$$D_\alpha\Big(w\|\, \tfrac{q^\sim}{\|q^\sim\|}\Big) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} + \ln\|q^\sim\| \qquad \forall w \in \mathcal{W}^{[f]}.$$

If $\|q^\sim\| < 1$ then $\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} D_\alpha(w\|\, q^\sim) < C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}}$. This, however, is impossible because of Theorem 1. Thus $\|q^\sim\| = 1$, $\big\|q^\perp\big\| = 0$ and $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} \prec \lambda$.

Since $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} \prec \lambda$, the Radon-Nikodym derivative $\frac{\mathrm{d}\,q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}$ exists by the Radon-Nikodym theorem [23, 5.5.4]. Since $\mathcal{W}^{[f]}$ is invariant under any mod one shift by construction, its Renyi center $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}}$ needs to be invariant under any mod one shift, as well. Furthermore, λ is invariant under any mod one shift. Hence,

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\,q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda} = \tfrac{\mathrm{d}\,q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda} \circ \mathtt{T}_x \qquad \forall x \in [0,1)$$

Thus $\frac{\mathrm{d}\,q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}$ needs to be a constant. That constant is one because $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}}$ is a probability measure. Therefore $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} = \lambda$ and $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} = \sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} D_\alpha(w\|\lambda)$. As a result $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} = D_\alpha(w_f\|\lambda)$ when $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}}$ is finite, as well.

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} = D_\alpha(w_f\|\lambda) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\ln\int f^\alpha(y)\lambda(\mathrm{d}y) & \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+ \neq 1 \\ \int f(y)\ln f(y)\lambda(\mathrm{d}y) & \alpha = 1 \\ \ln \underset{\lambda}{ess\,\sup} f(y) & \alpha = \infty \end{cases}. \tag{94}$$

In the preceding discussion in order to establish $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} = D_\alpha(w_f\|\lambda)$, we first proved that $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} = \lambda$ whenever $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}}$ exists, using the invariance of $\mathcal{W}^{[f]}$ and Lebesgue measure λ under mod one shifts. In a sense the arguments establishing $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} \ge D_\alpha(w_f\|\lambda)$ and $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} \le D_\alpha(w_f\|\lambda)$ are one and the same. In Appendix E, we present an alternative derivation in which two claims, $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} \ge D_\alpha(w_f\|\lambda)$ and $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} \le D_\alpha(w_f\|\lambda)$, are established separately. Discussion in Appendix E is interesting on its own right because of the way ergodicity is invoked for establishing $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} \ge D_\alpha(w_f\|\lambda)$.

As a result of Lemma 11, Renyi capacity —as a function of the order— is either continuous on $(0,\infty]$ or continuous and bounded on $(0,\phi]$ and infinite on $(\phi,\infty]$ for an $\phi \in [1,\infty)$. Following two examples are special cases of Example 4 which demonstrate that the Renyi capacity can be infinite for certain orders larger than one while being continuous on $(0,\infty]$ and Renyi capacity can have a discontinuity at any order in $[1,\infty)$.

Example 5 ($C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ can be infinite for certain values of α while being continuous on $\mathbb{R}^+$)**.** $f_\beta(y) = (1-\beta)y^{-\beta}$ and $\beta \in (0,1)$.

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f_\beta]}} = \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha\ln(1-\beta)-\ln(1-\alpha\beta)}{\alpha-1} & \alpha \in [0,1)\cup(1,\beta^{-1}) \\ \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} + \ln(1-\beta) & \alpha = 1 \\ \infty & \alpha \in [\beta^{-1},\infty] \end{cases}$$

Note that $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f_\beta]}}$ is a continuous and increasing function of α on $(0,\infty]$ for any $\beta \in (0,1)$.

Example 6 ($C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ can have a discontinuity at any order in $[1,\infty)$)**.** The existence of the discontinuity is related to the integrability of $f\ln f$ and f^α because $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} = D_\alpha(w_f\|\lambda)$.

[41] Agustin calls $\mathcal{W}^{[f]}$ "channel with additive noise on the unit circle."

- If $f(y)=2^{\frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{0<y<1/e\}}}{y(\ln 1/y)^3}}$ then $\sup_{\alpha\in(0,1]} D_\alpha(w_f\|\,\lambda)=\ln 2\sqrt{e}$ and $\inf_{\alpha\in(1,\infty]} D_\alpha(w_f\|\,\lambda)=\infty$.
- If $f(y)=\frac{(y^\phi \ln 1/y)^{-1}\mathbb{1}_{\{0<y<1/e\}}}{\int_{1-1/\phi}^{\infty} e^{-z}z^{-1}\lambda(\mathrm{d}z)}$ for an $\phi\in(1,\infty)$ then $\sup_{\alpha\in(0,\phi]} D_\alpha(w_f\|\,\lambda)=\frac{1}{\phi-1}\ln\frac{1}{\phi-1}-\frac{\phi}{\phi-1}\ln\int_{1-1/\phi}^{\infty} e^{-z}z^{-1}\lambda(\mathrm{d}z)$ and $\inf_{\alpha\in(\phi,\infty]} D_\alpha(w_f\|\,\lambda)=\infty$.

In Example 4 we have consider the modular shifts of a function. Instead of a single function, we can consider modular shifts of a set of functions. Given the expression for the Renyi capacity of modular shifts of a function, it is quite easy to determine the Renyi capacity of modular shifts of a set of functions.

Example 7 (Invariant Sets of Probability Measures for Modular Shifts on Unit Interval)**.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of non-negative Lebesgue measurable functions such that $\int f\lambda(\mathrm{d}y)=1$ for all $f\in\mathcal{F}$. Then $\mathcal{W}^{[\mathcal{F}]}$ is the set of all probability measures whose Radon-Nikodym derivative is a mod one shift of a member of $\mathcal{F}$:

$$\mathcal{W}^{[\mathcal{F}]}\triangleq\left\{w:\tfrac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}=f\circ\mathtt{T}_x \text{ for some } x\in[0,1) \text{ and for some } f\in\mathcal{F}\right\}\qquad\text{where}\qquad \mathtt{T}_x(y)\triangleq y-x-\lfloor y-x\rfloor. \tag{95}$$

For each $f\in\mathcal{F}$ we denote the measure whose Radon-Nikodym derivative is f by w_f.

$\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}}\le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[\mathcal{F}]}}$ because $\mathcal{W}^{[f]}\subset\mathcal{W}^{[\mathcal{F}]}\ \forall f\in\mathcal{F}$. Then $\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} D_\alpha(w_f\|\,\lambda)\le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[\mathcal{F}]}}$ because $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}}=D_\alpha(w_f\|\,\lambda)$.

On the other hand $w\in\mathcal{W}^{[\mathcal{F}]}$ iff $w\in\mathcal{W}^{[f]}$ for some $f\in\mathcal{F}$. Furthermore $D_\alpha(w\|\,\lambda)=D_\alpha(w_f\|\,\lambda)$ for all $w\in\mathcal{W}^{[f]}$. Thus $\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}^{[\mathcal{F}]}} D_\alpha(w\|\,\lambda)=\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} D_\alpha(w_f\|\,\lambda)$. Then $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[\mathcal{F}]}}\le\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} D_\alpha(w_f\|\,\lambda)$ by Lemma 13 for $q=\lambda$.

Thus $\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} D_\alpha(w_f\|\,\lambda)$ is both a lower bound and an upper bound on the order α Renyi capacity of $\mathcal{W}^{[\mathcal{F}]}$:

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[\mathcal{F}]}}=\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} D_\alpha(w_f\|\,\lambda)\qquad=\begin{cases}\sup\limits_{f\in\mathcal{F}}\frac{1}{\alpha-1}\ln\int f^\alpha(y)\lambda(\mathrm{d}y) & \alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\neq 1\\ \sup\limits_{f\in\mathcal{F}}\int f(y)\ln f(y)\lambda(\mathrm{d}y) & \alpha=1\\ \sup\limits_{f\in\mathcal{F}}\ln ess\sup\limits_{\lambda} f(y) & \alpha=\infty\end{cases}\qquad=\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}}. \tag{96}$$

C. Certain Families of Simple Poisson Point Processes With Integrable Intensity Functions

Examples we have considered thus far are useful in demonstrating the various subtleties about the Renyi capacity. Their output spaces are, however, very modest. Following examples demonstrate the generality of our analysis by determining the Renyi capacity of various families of Poisson point processes with integrable intensity functions, on real line.[42]

Poisson point processes are, sometimes, formulated and analyzed via the characterization of interarrival times without even mentioning the Radon-Nikodym derivatives, see [31, Chapter 2]. For many applications such an approach turns out to be sufficient; as a result the Radon-Nikodym derivatives of Poisson point processes are not as well known as one would expect. Considering this fact, we follow the approach of Burnashev and Kutoyants in [12] and start our discussion with a brief refresher on the Radon-Nikodym derivatives of Poisson processes.

For any $T\in(0,\infty)$ let $\mathcal{X}_T$ be the set of all non-decreasing, right-continuous, integer valued functions on $[0,T]$. Evidently, all sample paths of Poisson point processes are members of $\mathcal{X}_T$. Furthermore any Poisson point process with deterministic intensity function f can be represented by a unique probability measure on the measurable space $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ for $\mathcal{Y}=\mathcal{X}_T$ when $\mathcal{Y}$ is an appropriately chosen $\sigma-$algebra.[43]

For any sample path $y\in\mathcal{Y}$, we denote the j^{th} arrival time by $\tau_j(y)$ and the counting process at time t by $N_t(y)$. The probability measure associated with a Poisson process with intensity function f is denoted by w_f. The probability measure of the Poisson process with constant intensity γ is denoted ν_γ and the probability measure of the Poisson process with unit intensity is denoted ν, i.e. $\nu=\nu_1$.

For any non-negative integrable function f on $[0,T]$ associated probability measures w_f is absolutely continuous with respect to ν and the Radon-Nikodym derivative $\frac{\mathrm{d}w_f}{\mathrm{d}\nu}$ is given by,[44] [12, (2.1)], [8, VI.6.T12, p187],

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{d}w_f}{\mathrm{d}\nu}(y)=\left(\prod\nolimits_{\tau_j(y)\le T} f(\tau_j(y))\right)e^{\int_0^T(1-f(t))\lambda(\mathrm{d}t)}. \tag{97}$$

[42] Analysis we present in the following can be applied to spatial Poisson processes defined on appropriately chosen subsets of the Euclidean space without any major modification. We restrict our analysis to the one dimensional case, because even the one dimensional case has a structure that is rich enough to convey the generality of our framework.

[43] One choice of $\mathcal{Y}$ that works is $\mathcal{Y}=\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}_T,s)$ where $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}_T,s)$ is the Borel $\sigma-$algebra for the topology generated by the Skorokhod metric s on $\mathcal{X}_T$. In fact, Borel $\sigma-$algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}_T,s)$ is rich enough to express Poisson point processes whose intensity functions are not deterministic but Markovian, i.e. the intensity at any $t\in[0,T]$ depends on the previous arrivals. Kabanov's original work [44] considers such Poisson point processes.

[44] The expression $\left(\prod_{\tau_j(y)\le T} f(\tau_j(y))\right)$ stands for 1 for those y's that do not have any arrivals.

Using (97) we can get the following expectation equality[45] for any non-negative measurable function g, [12, (2.2)],

$$\int \left(\prod\nolimits_{\tau_\jmath(y)\leq T} g(\tau_\jmath(y)) \right) w_f(\mathrm{d}y) = e^{\int_0^T (g(t)-1) f(t) \lambda(\mathrm{d}t)}. \tag{98}$$

An immediate consequence of (97) and (98) is the following expression for integrable intensity functions f and g:

$$D_\alpha(w_f \| \, w_g) = \begin{cases} \int_0^T \left(\frac{f^\alpha g^{1-\alpha} - f}{\alpha - 1} - f + g \right) \lambda(\mathrm{d}t) & \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{1\} \\ \int_0^T \left(f \ln \frac{f}{g} - f + g \right) \lambda(\mathrm{d}t) & \alpha = 1 \end{cases}. \tag{99}$$

For orders other than one (99) follows from (97) and (98) by substitution, via the alternative expression for the Renyi divergence given in (25). For $\alpha = 1$ case, note that $D_1(w_f \| \, w_g) = \lim_{\alpha \uparrow 1} D_\alpha(w_f \| \, w_g)$ because the Renyi divergence is continuous in order on $[0, 1]$ by Lemma 9-(a). Then the expression for $D_1(w_f \| \, w_g)$ follows from the dominated convergence theorem [7, 2.8.1] and the expression for $D_\alpha(w_f \| \, w_g)$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ because $\frac{x^\alpha - x}{\alpha - 1} \uparrow x \ln x$ as $\alpha \uparrow 1$ for any $x \geq 0$.

In order to be able to refer to various families of Poisson point processes without confusion, we adopt the following convention.

Definition 10. For any $T \in (0, \infty)$ and intensity levels a, ϱ and b such that $0 \leq a \leq \varrho \leq b \leq \infty$, let $\mathit{\Lambda}^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}$, $\mathit{\Lambda}^{[T,a,b,<\varrho]}$, $\mathit{\Lambda}^{[T,a,b,>\varrho]}$ and $\mathit{\Lambda}^{[T,a,b]}$ be the set of all Poisson point processes with $[a, b]$ valued deterministic integrable intensity functions on $[0, T]$ with average ϱ, with average less than ϱ, with average greater than ϱ, and with any average, respectively:

$$\mathit{\Lambda}^{[T,a,b,\varrho]} \triangleq \left\{ w_f : f \in \mathcal{L}_1(\lambda) \text{ such that } f : [0, T] \to [a, b] \text{ and } \int_0^T f(t) \lambda(\mathrm{d}t) = T\varrho \right\} \tag{100}$$

$$\mathit{\Lambda}^{[T,a,b,<\varrho]} \triangleq \left\{ w_f : f \in \mathcal{L}_1(\lambda) \text{ such that } f : [0, T] \to [a, b] \text{ and } \int_0^T f(t) \lambda(\mathrm{d}t) < T\varrho \right\} \tag{101}$$

$$\mathit{\Lambda}^{[T,a,b,>\varrho]} \triangleq \left\{ w_f : f \in \mathcal{L}_1(\lambda) \text{ such that } f : [0, T] \to [a, b] \text{ and } \int_0^T f(t) \lambda(\mathrm{d}t) > T\varrho \right\} \tag{102}$$

$$\mathit{\Lambda}^{[T,a,b]} \triangleq \left\{ w_f : f \in \mathcal{L}_1(\lambda) \text{ such that } f : [0, T] \to [a, b] \right\}. \tag{103}$$

Example 8 (Poisson Point Processes With Bounded Intensity Functions with a Given Average)**.** For any $T \in (0, \infty)$ and intensity levels a, ϱ and b such that $0 \leq a \leq \varrho \leq b < \infty$ we have[46]

$$C_{\alpha, \mathit{\Lambda}^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}} = \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} (\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho} - \varrho) T & \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{1\} \\ \left(\frac{\varrho - a}{b - a} b \ln \frac{b}{\varrho} + \frac{b - \varrho}{b - a} a \ln \frac{a}{\varrho} \right) T & \alpha = 1 \end{cases} \tag{104}$$

$$q_{\alpha, \mathit{\Lambda}^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}} = \nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho}} \tag{105}$$

$$\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho} \triangleq \left(\frac{\varrho - a}{b - a} b^\alpha + \frac{b - \varrho}{b - a} a^\alpha \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \qquad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+. \tag{106}$$

An alternative expression for $C_{\alpha, \mathit{\Lambda}^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}}$ that might be easier to remember is the following:

$$C_{\alpha, \mathit{\Lambda}^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}} = \tfrac{\varrho - a}{b - a} D_\alpha\big(\nu_b \| \, \nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho}}\big) + \tfrac{b - \varrho}{b - a} D_\alpha\big(\nu_a \| \, \nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho}}\big). \tag{107}$$

Note that the cases when $\varrho = a$ and $\varrho = b$ are trivial because in those cases $\mathit{\Lambda}^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}$ has just one element and $\mathit{\Lambda}^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}$'s order α Renyi capacity is equal to zero. For the case $a < \varrho < b$ we determine the Renyi capacity and Renyi center assuming that $\frac{\varrho - a}{b - a}$ is a rational number by giving a sequence of priors $\{p^{(\imath)}\}$ and a probability measure $q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ such that $\lim_{\imath \to \infty} I_\alpha\big(p^{(\imath)}; \mathit{\Lambda}^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}\big) = \sup_{w \in \mathit{\Lambda}^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}} D_\alpha(w \| \, q)$. Then we determine Renyi capacity of $\mathit{\Lambda}^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}$ with irrational $\frac{\varrho - a}{b - a}$ using the continuity of the resulting expression in b and the monotonicity of $C_{\alpha, \mathcal{W}}$ in $\mathcal{W}$.

There exists positive integers ℓ and n such that $\frac{\varrho - a}{b - a} = \frac{\ell}{n}$ because $\frac{\varrho - a}{b - a}$ is a rational number and $\varrho > a$. Then there are $\binom{n}{\ell}$ length n sequences of a's and b's with ℓ b's and $(n - \ell)$ a's. These sequences will be the building blocks for the intensity functions we have for the w_f's with positive $p^{(\imath)}(w_f)$.

For each positive integer $\imath$ let us divide the interval $[0, T]$ into $2^\imath n + 1$ pieces: $2^\imath n$ length $\frac{T}{2^\imath n}$half open intervals of the form $(\frac{\jmath - 1}{2^\imath n} T, \frac{\jmath}{2^\imath n} T]$ for $\jmath \in \{1, \ldots, 2^\imath n\}$ and the point $\{0\}$. Now consider f's such that:

[45] In [12], using a notation that might seem cryptic to neophytes, Burnashev and Kutoyants express the Radon-Nikodym derivative identity given in (97) and the expectation identity given in (98) more succinctly and elegantly:

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{d}w_f}{\mathrm{d}\nu}(y) = e^{\int_0^T (\ln f(t)) y(\mathrm{d}t) + \int_0^T (1 - f(t)) \lambda(\mathrm{d}t)} \qquad \int e^{\int_0^T (\ln g(t)) y(\mathrm{d}t)} w_f(\mathrm{d}y) = e^{\int_0^T (g(t) - 1) f(t) \lambda(\mathrm{d}t)}.$$

In expressions $\int_0^T (\ln f(t)) y(\mathrm{d}t)$ and $\int_0^T (\ln g(t)) y(\mathrm{d}t)$, the sample path y is interpreted as a measure that is equal to the sum of unit Dirac delta functions located at the arrival times of the sample path y.

[46] $C_{\infty, \mathit{\Lambda}^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}}$ and $q_{\infty, \mathit{\Lambda}^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}}$ can be calculated using the continuity in order: $C_{\infty, \mathit{\Lambda}^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}} = b - \varrho$ and $\beta_{\infty,a,b,\varrho} = b$.

- f is $\{a,b\}$ valued function that is constant in all intervals of the form $(\frac{\jmath-1}{2^\imath n}T, \frac{\jmath}{2^\imath n}T]$ for $\jmath \in \{1,\ldots,2^\imath n\}$.
- $f(0)=a$
- $\ell = \sum_{\kappa=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{f(\frac{n\jmath-\kappa}{2^\imath n}T)=b\}}$ for all $\jmath \in \{1,\ldots,2^\imath\}$.

Note that for every such f corresponding w_f is in $\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}$. Furthermore, there are $\binom{n}{\ell}^{(2^\imath)}$ distinct f's. The prior $p^{(\imath)}$ has equal probability mass on all w_f's with above described f's. Then using equation (97) we can calculate the Radon-Nikodym derivative of $\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}$, i.e. the order α Renyi mean for prior $p^{(\imath)}$.

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}(y) = e^{(1-\varrho)T}\left(\sum_{\kappa=0}^{\binom{n}{\ell}^{(2^\imath)}} \frac{1}{\binom{n}{\ell}^{(2^\imath)}}\left(\prod\nolimits_{\tau_\jmath(y)\le T} f_\kappa(\tau_\jmath(y))\right)^\alpha\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}.$$

For those sample paths, i.e. y's, that do not have more than one arrival in any of the intervals of the form $(\frac{\jmath-1}{2^\imath}T, \frac{\jmath}{2^\imath}T]$, one can simplify the expression for the Radon-Nikodym derivative significantly. In particular,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}(y) = e^{(1-\varrho)T}\left(\frac{\ell b^\alpha+(n-\ell)a^\alpha}{n}\right)^{\frac{N_T(y)-N_0(y)}{\alpha}} \qquad \forall y\in\mathcal{E}_\imath$$

where $\mathcal{E}_\imath \in \mathcal{Y}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{E}_\imath \triangleq \left\{y : \left|N_{\frac{\jmath}{2^\imath}T}(y) - N_{\frac{\jmath-1}{2^\imath}T}(y)\right| \le 1 \text{ for all } \jmath\in\{1,\ldots,2^\imath\}\right\}.$$

Furthermore, since $\mathcal{E}_\imath \subset \mathcal{E}_{\imath+1}$ we have

$$\lim_{\imath\to\infty}\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}(y) = e^{(1-\varrho)T}\left(\frac{\ell b^\alpha+(n-\ell)a^\alpha}{n}\right)^{\frac{N_T(y)-N_0(y)}{\alpha}} \qquad \forall y\in\mathcal{E} \qquad \text{where } \mathcal{E}\triangleq\cup_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}\mathcal{E}_\imath.$$

Using the complete independence of Poisson processes on disjoint intervals and the probability mass function of the counting process, [31, Theorem 2.2.10], [8, II.1.(1.9), p22], we can calculate the probability $\nu(\mathcal{E}_\imath)$:

$$\nu(\mathcal{E}_\imath) = (e^{-\frac{T}{2^\imath}} + \tfrac{T}{2^\imath}e^{-\frac{T}{2^\imath}})^{(2^\imath)} = e^{-T}(1+\tfrac{T}{2^\imath})^{(2^\imath)}.$$

Then $\lim_{\imath\to\infty}\nu(\mathcal{E}_\imath)=1$ and consequently $\nu(\mathcal{E})=1$. Thus convergence on $\mathcal{E}$ implies $\nu-$a.e. convergence:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}(y) \xrightarrow{\nu-a.e.} e^{(1-\varrho)T}\left(\frac{\ell b^\alpha+(n-\ell)a^\alpha}{n}\right)^{\frac{N_T(y)-N_0(y)}{\alpha}}.$$

On the other hand $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}(y) \le e^{(1-\varrho)T}\frac{b^{N_T(y)}}{b^{N_0(y)}}$ because $f(t)\le b$. Furthermore $\int e^{(1-\varrho)T}\frac{b^{N_T(y)}}{b^{N_0(y)}}\nu(\mathrm{d}y) = e^{(b-\varrho)T}$. Thus as a result of the dominated convergence theorem [7, 2.8.1] we have,[47]

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\imath\to\infty}\left\|\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\right\| &= \int e^{(1-\varrho)T}\left(\frac{\ell b^\alpha+(n-\ell)a^\alpha}{n}\right)^{\frac{N_T(y)-N_0(y)}{\alpha}}\nu(\mathrm{d}y)\\ &= e^{\left(\left(\frac{\ell b^\alpha+(n-\ell)a^\alpha}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}-\varrho\right)T}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus using the definition of the order α Renyi information and the fact that $\frac{\varrho-a}{b-a}=\frac{\ell}{n}$ we get

$$\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\left(p^{(\imath)};\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}\right) = \tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\left(\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho}-\varrho\right)T \qquad \forall\alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\}.$$

On the other hand, Renyi information is an increasing function of the order α by Lemma 5. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{\imath\to\infty} I_1\left(p^{(\imath)};\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}\right) &\ge \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)}\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\left(p^{(\imath)};\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}\right) &&= \sup_{\alpha\in(0,1)}\tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\left(\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho}-\varrho\right)T\\ \limsup_{\imath\to\infty} I_1\left(p^{(\imath)};\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}\right) &\le \inf_{\alpha\in(1,\infty)}\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\left(p^{(\imath)};\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}\right) &&= \inf_{\alpha\in(1,\infty)}\tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\left(\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho}-\varrho\right)T\end{aligned}$$

Using l'Hospital's rule [58, Theorem 5.13] and the expression for $\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho}$ given in (106) we get

$$\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_1\left(p^{(\imath)};\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}\right) = \left(\tfrac{\varrho-a}{b-a}b\ln\tfrac{b}{\varrho} + \tfrac{b-\varrho}{b-a}a\ln\tfrac{a}{\varrho}\right)T.$$

Thus we have established that expression given in (104) is a lower bound on the Renyi capacity.

[47] Using the dominated convergence theorem one can also show that $q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}$ converges in total variation topology to $\nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho}}$, i.e. the probability measure of the Poisson point process with constant intensity $\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho}$.

In order to show that it is also an upper bound we use Lemma 13. For any bounded intensity function $f : [0, T] \to [a, b]$ such that $\int_0^T f(t)\lambda(\mathrm{d}t) = T\varrho$ and for any $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$ as a result of (99) we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
D_\alpha(w_f \| \nu_\gamma) &= \int_0^T \left(\tfrac{\gamma^{1-\alpha}}{\alpha-1} f^\alpha(t) - \tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} f(t) + \gamma \right) \lambda(\mathrm{d}t) \\
&\leq \int_0^T \left(\tfrac{\gamma^{1-\alpha}}{\alpha-1} \left(\tfrac{f(t)-a}{b-a} b^\alpha + \tfrac{a-f(t)}{b-a} a^\alpha \right) - \tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} f(t) + \gamma \right) \lambda(\mathrm{d}t) \\
&= \left(\tfrac{\gamma^{1-\alpha}}{\alpha-1} \left(\tfrac{\varrho-a}{b-a} b^\alpha + \tfrac{a-\varrho}{b-a} a^\alpha \right) - \tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \varrho + \gamma \right) T \\
&= \tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} (\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho} - \varrho)\, T + D_\alpha\big(\nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho}} \big\| \nu_\gamma\big) \\
&= \tfrac{\varrho-a}{b-a} D_\alpha\big(\nu_b \| \nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho}}\big) + \tfrac{b-\varrho}{b-a} D_\alpha\big(\nu_a \| \nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho}}\big) + D_\alpha\big(\nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho}} \big\| \nu_\gamma\big)
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from the convexity of the function $\frac{x^\alpha}{\alpha-1}$ in x and the Jensen's inequality. Thus applying Lemma 13 for $q = \nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho}}$ we see that expression on the right hand side of (104) is also an upper bound when $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{1\}$. For $\alpha = 1$ case claim follows from a similar argument using the convexity of $x \ln x$ instead of the convexity of $\frac{x^\alpha}{\alpha-1}$.

Recall that we have assumed that $\frac{\varrho-a}{b-a}$ is a rational number. We now prove that (104) holds for irrational $\frac{\varrho-a}{b-a}$ as well. Note that for any T, a, ϱ, b_1 and b_2 such that $a \leq \varrho \leq b_1 \leq b_2$, $\Lambda^{[T,a,b_1,\varrho]} \subset \Lambda^{[T,a,b_2,\varrho]}$ by the definition of $\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}$ given in (100). Then $C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b_1,\varrho]}} \leq C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b_2,\varrho]}}$ as a result of the definition of the order α Renyi capacity. Thus for any b_0 such that $b_0 \in (\varrho, \infty)$

$$\sup_{b \in \chi_{a,\varrho} \cap (\varrho, b_0]} C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}} \leq C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b_0,\varrho]}} \leq \inf_{b \in \chi_{a,\varrho} \cap [b_0, \infty)} C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}} \qquad \chi_{a,\varrho} = \left\{ b : \tfrac{\varrho-a}{b-a} \in \mathbb{Q} \right\}.$$

Then (104) holds for the case when $\frac{\varrho-a}{b-a}$ is irrational as result of the continuity of the expression on the right hand side of (104) as a function of b for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}+$.

Note that $\nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho}}$ is the unique Renyi center described in Theorem 1 because

$$\sup\nolimits_{w \in \Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}} D_\alpha\big(w \| \nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho}}\big) = C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}}.$$

by equations (99), (100), and (104).

Using the expressions for $C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}}$ and $q_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}}$ given in (104) and (105), we can calculate the order α Renyi capacity and Renyi center of various families of Poisson point processes.

Example 9 (Poisson Point Processes With Bounded Intensity Functions with Constrained Average)**.** For any $T \in (0, \infty)$ and intensity levels a, ϱ and b such that $0 \leq a \leq \varrho \leq b < \infty$ we have[48]

$$C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,<\varrho]}} = C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho \wedge \varrho_{\alpha,a,b}]}} \qquad C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,>\varrho]}} = C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho \vee \varrho_{\alpha,a,b}]}} \tag{108}$$

$$q_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,<\varrho]}} = q_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho \wedge \varrho_{\alpha,a,b}]}} \qquad q_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,>\varrho]}} = q_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho \vee \varrho_{\alpha,a,b}]}} \tag{109}$$

where $C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}}$ and $q_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}}$ are given in equations (104) and (105) and $\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}$ is given by

$$\varrho_{\alpha,a,b} \triangleq \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} (b-a)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}}{(b^\alpha - a^\alpha)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}} + \frac{a b^\alpha - b a^\alpha}{b^\alpha - a^\alpha} & \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{1\} \\ \frac{b^{\frac{b}{b-a}} a^{-\frac{a}{b-a}}}{e} & \alpha = 1 \end{cases}. \tag{110}$$

In order to establish (108) let us first note that $\Lambda^{[T,a,b,<\varrho]}$ and $\Lambda^{[T,a,b,>\varrho]}$ are nothing but the union of $\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\xi]}$ for ξ in $[a, \varrho)$ and $(\varrho, b]$, respectively:

$$\Lambda^{[T,a,b,<\varrho]} = \bigcup\nolimits_{\xi \in [a,\varrho)} \Lambda^{[T,a,b,\xi]} \qquad \Lambda^{[T,a,b,>\varrho]} = \bigcup\nolimits_{\xi \in (\varrho,b]} \Lambda^{[T,a,b,\xi]}$$

Thus as a result of the definition of the order α Renyi capacity,

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,<\varrho]}} &\geq \sup\nolimits_{\xi \in [a,\varrho)} C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\xi]}} & C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,<\varrho]}} &\geq \sup\nolimits_{\xi \in (\varrho,b]} C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\xi]}} \\ &= C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho \wedge \varrho_{\alpha,a,b}]}} & &= C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho \vee \varrho_{\alpha,a,b}]}} \end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

The equalities in the second line follow from the fact that $C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\xi]}}$, given in (104), is an increasing continuous function of ξ on $[a, \varrho_{\alpha,a,b}]$ and a decreasing continuous function of ξ on $[\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}, b]$.

Convexity of the function $\frac{x^\alpha - x}{\alpha-1}$ in x for $\alpha \neq 1$ and convexity of the function $x \ln x$ in x for $\alpha = 1$ can be used together with equation (99) to obtain

$$D_\alpha(w \| \nu_\gamma) \leq \tfrac{b-\xi}{b-a} D_\alpha(\nu_a \| \nu_\gamma) + \tfrac{\xi-a}{b-a} D_\alpha(\nu_b \| \nu_\gamma) \qquad \forall w \in \Lambda^{[T,a,b,\xi]}.$$

[48] Order ∞ Renyi capacity can be calculated using the continuity in order: $C_{\infty,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,<\varrho]}} = b - a$, and $C_{\infty,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,>\varrho]}} = b - \varrho$. Furthermore $\varrho_{\infty,a,b} = a$.

On the other hand as a result of the definition of $\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\xi}$ given in (106) and the definition of $\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}$ given in (110) we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha\big(\nu_a\|\,\nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\xi}}\big) &\le D_\alpha\big(\nu_b\|\,\nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\xi}}\big) && \forall \xi \in [a,\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}] \\ D_\alpha\big(\nu_a\|\,\nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\xi}}\big) &\ge D_\alpha\big(\nu_b\|\,\nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\xi}}\big) && \forall \xi \in [\varrho_{\alpha,a,b},b] \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{w\in\Lambda^{[T,a,b,<\varrho]}} D_\alpha\Big(w\|\,\nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho\wedge\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}}}\Big) &\le \tfrac{b-\varrho\wedge\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}}{b-a} D_\alpha\Big(\nu_a\|\,\nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho\wedge\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}}}\Big) + \tfrac{\varrho\wedge\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}-a}{b-a} D_\alpha\Big(\nu_b\|\,\nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho\wedge\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}}}\Big) \\ &= C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho\wedge\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}]}} \qquad (112) \\ \sup_{w\in\Lambda^{[T,a,b,>\varrho]}} D_\alpha\Big(w\|\,\nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho\vee\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}}}\Big) &\le \tfrac{b-\varrho\vee\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}}{b-a} D_\alpha\Big(\nu_a\|\,\nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho\vee\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}}}\Big) + \tfrac{\varrho\vee\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}-a}{b-a} D_\alpha\Big(\nu_b\|\,\nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho\vee\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}}}\Big) \\ &= C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho\vee\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}]}} \qquad (113) \end{aligned}$$

where (112) and (113) follow from the alternative expression for $C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\xi]}}$ given in (107).

Applying Lemma 13 on $\Lambda^{[T,a,b,<\varrho]}$ for $q=\nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho\wedge\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}}}$ and on $\Lambda^{[T,a,b,>\varrho]}$ for $q=\nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho\vee\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}}}$ we get,

$$C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,<\varrho]}} \le C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho\wedge\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}]}} \qquad C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,>\varrho]}} \le C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho\vee\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}]}}. \qquad (114)$$

Then equation (108) follows from (111) and (114), and equation (109) follows from (108), (112), (113) and Theorem 1.

Example 10 (Poisson Point Processes With Bounded Intensity Functions)**.** First note that $\Lambda^{[T,a,b]}=\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\le b]}$ and $\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\le b]}$ is in the closure of $\Lambda^{[T,a,b,<b]}$ in the topology of setwise convergence. Then $C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b]}}=C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,<b]}}$ by Lemma 21-(b) and $q_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b]}}=q_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,<b]}}$ by Theorem 1. On the other hand as a result of (108), (109), and (110) we have

$$C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,<b]}}=C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}]}} \qquad q_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,<b]}}=q_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}]}}.$$

Thus using equations (104), (105) and (110) we get,[49]

$$C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b]}}=C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}]}} = \begin{cases} \left(\dfrac{\alpha^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}(b-a)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}}{(b^\alpha-a^\alpha)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}}-\dfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\dfrac{ab^\alpha-ba^\alpha}{b^\alpha-a^\alpha}\right)T & \alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\} \\ \left(\dfrac{b^{\frac{b}{b-a}}a^{-\frac{a}{b-a}}}{e}-\dfrac{ab}{b-a}\ln\dfrac{b}{a}\right)T & \alpha=1 \end{cases} \qquad (115)$$

$$q_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b]}}=q_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}]}} = \nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b}} \qquad (116)$$

$$\beta_{\alpha,a,b}\triangleq\beta_{\alpha,a,b,\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}} = \begin{cases} \dfrac{\alpha^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}(b-a)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}}{(b^\alpha-a^\alpha)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}} & \alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\} \\ \dfrac{b^{\frac{b}{b-a}}a^{-\frac{a}{b-a}}}{e} & \alpha=1 \end{cases}. \qquad (117)$$

An alternative expression for $C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b]}}$ that is equivalent to (115) is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b]}} &= \tfrac{\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}-a}{b-a} D_\alpha\big(\nu_b\|\,\nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b}}\big) + \tfrac{b-\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}}{b-a} D_\alpha\big(\nu_a\|\,\nu_{\beta_{\alpha,a,b}}\big) \qquad (118) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\left(\beta_{\alpha,a,b}-\varrho_{\alpha,a,b}\right)T & \alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\} \\ \left(\frac{\varrho_{1,a,b}-a}{b-a}b\ln\frac{b}{\varrho_{1,a,b}}+\frac{b-\varrho_{1,a,b}}{b-a}a\ln\frac{a}{\varrho_{1,a,b}}\right)T & \alpha=1 \end{cases}. \qquad (119) \end{aligned}$$

In the previous examples, we have used the expressions for the order α Renyi capacity and Renyi center of $\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}$ to determine the order α Renyi capacity and Renyi center of other families of Poisson point processes with bounded intensity functions. Following example considers a family of Poisson point processes with intensity functions are not bounded.

Example 11 (Poisson Point Processes With Constrained Intensity Function Average)**.** For any $T\in(0,\infty)$ and intensity levels a and ϱ such that $0\le a\le\varrho<\infty$ we have

$$C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,\infty,\varrho]}}=C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,\infty,<\varrho]}} = \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}(a-\varrho)T & \alpha\in(0,1) \\ \infty & \alpha\in[1,\infty) \end{cases} \qquad (120)$$

$$q_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,\infty,\varrho]}}=q_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,\infty,<\varrho]}} = \nu_a \qquad \forall\alpha\in(0,1). \qquad (121)$$

Note that for any $\tilde\varrho>\varrho$ as a result of Definition 10 we have

$$\bigcup\nolimits_{b\in(\varrho,\infty)}\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}\subset\Lambda^{[T,a,\infty,\varrho]}\subset\Lambda^{[T,a,\infty,<\tilde\varrho]}.$$

[49]The order ∞ Renyi capacity and Renyi center can be calculated using the continuity in the order: $C_{\infty,\Lambda^{[T,a,b]}}=b-a$ and $\beta_{\infty,a,b}=b$.

Then using definition of the order α Renyi capacity and the expression for $C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}}$ given in (104) we get

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,\infty,<\tilde{\varrho}]}} \geq C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,\infty,\varrho]}} &\geq \limsup_{b\uparrow\infty} C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}} \\ &= \tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}(a-\varrho) \qquad\qquad \forall \alpha \in (0,1), \forall \tilde{\varrho} > \varrho. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the expression given in (120) is a lower bound for both $C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,\infty,\varrho]}}$ and $C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,\infty,<\varrho]}}$.

On the other hand, by the expression for the order α Renyi divergence given in (99) we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha(w_f \| \nu_a) &= \int_0^T \left(\tfrac{a}{\alpha-1} \left(\tfrac{f(t)}{a} \right)^\alpha - \tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} f(t) + a \right) \lambda(\mathrm{d}t) \\ &\leq \int_0^T \left(\tfrac{a}{\alpha-1} - \tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} f(t) + a \right) \lambda(\mathrm{d}t) \\ &= \int_0^T \tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}(a - f(t)) \lambda(\mathrm{d}t) \\ &\leq \tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\,(a-\varrho)\,T \qquad\qquad \forall \alpha \in (0,1), \forall w_f \in \Lambda^{[T,a,\infty,\leq\varrho]}. \end{aligned}$$

Then if we apply Lemma 13 to $\Lambda^{[T,a,\infty,\leq\varrho]}$ for $q = \nu_a$ we get

$$C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,\infty,\leq\varrho]}} \leq \tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\,(a-\varrho)\,T.$$

Since $\Lambda^{[T,a,\infty,\leq\varrho]} = \Lambda^{[T,a,\infty,\varrho]} \cup \Lambda^{[T,a,\infty,<\varrho]}$, this will imply that the expression given in (120) is an upper bound for both $C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,\infty,\varrho]}}$ and $C_{\alpha,\Lambda^{[T,a,\infty,<\varrho]}}$.

For families of Poisson point processes with bounded intensity functions, i.e. $\Lambda^{[T,a,b,\varrho]}$, $\Lambda^{[T,a,b,<\varrho]}$, $\Lambda^{[T,a,b,>\varrho]}$ or $\Lambda^{[T,a,b]}$ for $b < \infty$, the order α Renyi centers are Poisson processes with positive intensity, even when $a = 0$. As a result all members of the family are absolutely continuous with respect to the order α Renyi center. For $\Lambda^{[T,a,\infty,\varrho]}$ and $\Lambda^{[T,a,\infty,<\varrho]}$ this is the case only when $a > 0$. For $\Lambda^{[T,0,\infty,\varrho]}$ and $\Lambda^{[T,0,\infty,<\varrho]}$, the order α Renyi center is the trivial Poisson process with zero intensity, i.e. all of the probability is on the sample path without any arrivals.

VI. Discussion and Future Directions

We have defined and analyzed the order α Renyi capacity $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ and the order α Renyi radius $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for an arbitrary set of probability measures $\mathcal{W}$ on an arbitrary measurable space. Our most important contributions are Erven-Harremoes bound, i.e. Lemma 16, and two uniform equicontinuity results on the Renyi information, i.e. Lemma 12-(d,e). We have also proved a minimax theorem, i.e. Theorem 1, which has already been reported by Augustin [4],[5] in a different form. Theorem 1 establishes not only the equality of $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ and $S_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for any α and $\mathcal{W}$ but also the existence and the uniqueness of the order α Renyi center $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ whenever $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is finite. Our analysis of lead to certain immediate consequences for two generalizations of $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$: $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A})$ defined for $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ and $C_{\alpha,W}$ defined for transition probability W. We introduce those generalizations and discuss the implications of our analysis on them in Appendices F and G.

Results of our analysis, also, encourage one to consider certain related problems:

- We have not assumed any topological structure on the output space $\mathcal{Y}$. Although this is a strength because of the generality of our results, it is also a weakness because of the obliviousness of our analysis towards the interactions between Renyi's information quantities and the topological structure of the output space. In almost all of the applications $\mathcal{Y}$ is a Borel or Baire σ-algebra of the topological space $(\mathcal{Y}, \tau)$; but usually there is an even more specific structure. In all of the examples we have considered in Section V and in most of the applications $\mathcal{Y}$ is the Borel σ-algebra of a complete separable metric space $(\mathcal{Y}, d)$. Thus one can define metrics other than the total variation metric on $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ using the metric d and analyze the behavior of Renyi's information quantities on the resulting topologies. Such models have already been considered in the context of arbitrarily varying channels [18], [71] and typicality [43], [52], [55].
- It is easy to confirm that continuity of the order α Renyi capacity as a function of the order α imply the continuity of the corresponding f-capacity $\mathcal{C}_{f_\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ as a function of α where $f_\alpha(x) = \frac{x^\alpha - 1}{\alpha - 1}$. The existence of similar, but more general, continuity results for richer classes of f-divergences with appropriate topologies is expected. What is plausible, but not evident, to us is the existence of a topology on the set of all convex f's that ensures the continuity of corresponding f-capacities in f for all $\mathcal{W}$ on the region that f-capacities are finite. In any event, the interaction of topologies on the space of convex functions and corresponding f-capacities seems to be a fertile subject of inquiry.

We have avoided using information theoretic concepts such as code, channel, or rate in our discussion because we believe Renyi's information quantities can and should be defined and understood on their own as measure theoretic concepts first. Renyi's information quantities, however, do have operational meaning in various information transmission problems. We discuss the case of channel coding problems in the sequel of this paper.

APPENDIX

A. Proofs of The Lemmas on Weighted Power Means of Probability Measures

Proof of Lemma 1:

(1-a) For any $\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{X}_p$ and $\alpha \in (0,\infty)$ we have

$$(p(\tilde{w}))^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \tfrac{\mathrm{d}\tilde{w}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} \leq \left(\sum\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} p(w) \left(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \leq \bigvee\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} \tfrac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\nu} \leq \sum\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} \tfrac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\nu}.$$

Then for any $\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{X}_p$, $\alpha \in (0,\infty]$ and $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{Y}$,

$$(p(\tilde{w}))^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \tilde{w}(\mathcal{E}) \leq \mu_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{E}) \leq \sum\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} w(\mathcal{E}).$$

Thus for any $\alpha \in (0,\infty]$, $\mu_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{E}) = 0$ iff $w(\mathcal{E}) = 0$ for all $w \in \mathcal{X}_p$. Then $\mu_{1,p}(\mathcal{E}) \sim \mu_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{E})$ for all $\alpha \in (0,\infty]$. $\forall p \exists \tilde{w} \in \mathcal{X}_p$ such that $p(\tilde{w}) \geq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{X}_p|}$ and $\|w\| = 1$ $\forall w \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$. Then $|\mathcal{X}_p|^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \leq \|\mu_{\alpha,p}\| \leq |\mathcal{X}_p|$ and $\|\mu_{1,p}\| = 1$.

(1-b) As a result of Holder's inequality,

$$\mu_{0,p}(\mathcal{E}) = \int_{\mathcal{E}} \prod\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} \left(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{p(w)} \nu(\mathrm{d}y) \qquad \leq \prod\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} \left(\int_{\mathcal{E}} \tfrac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\nu(\mathrm{d}y)\right)^{p(w)} \qquad = \prod\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} (w(\mathcal{E}))^{p(w)}.$$

Then $\mu_{0,p}(\mathcal{E}) = 0$ whenever $w(\mathcal{E}) = 0$ and $\mu_{0,p} \prec w \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{X}_p$. Since $w(\mathcal{Y}) = 1$ $\forall w \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, $\|\mu_{0,p}\| = \mu_{0,p}(\mathcal{Y}) \leq 1$. ■

Proof of Lemma 2:

(2-a) $p_{[1]}(w|y) = p(w)\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p}}$ for all w such that $p(w) > 0$ by the definition of $p_{[\alpha]}(w|y)$ given in equation (4). Then equation (5) follows from the definitions of $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}$ and $\pi_{\alpha,p}$ given in equations (1) and (3).
On the other hand, $w \prec \mu_{1,p}$ for all w such that $p(w) > 0$ by definition and $\mu_{\alpha,p} \sim \mu_{1,p}$ by Lemma 1. Thus,

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}} = \tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p}}{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}\tfrac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p}} \qquad = \tfrac{1}{\pi_{\alpha,p}}\tfrac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p}} \qquad = \tfrac{1}{\pi_{\alpha,p}}\tfrac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)} \qquad \forall w : p(w) > 0$$

Then equation (6) follows from the definition of $p_{[\alpha]}(w|y)$ given in (4).

(2-b) $\frac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)}$ is a non-negative real number for all w in $\mathcal{X}_p$ and $\frac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)}$ is positive at least for one w in $\mathcal{X}_p$. Then $\pi_{\alpha,p}$ given in equation (5) is a smooth function[50] of α on $\mathbb{R}^+$. Identities given in (7) and (8) follow from the chain rule and elementary rules of differentiation.

(2-c) As a result of Holder's inequality we have,

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\pi_{\alpha_\beta,p}\right)^{\alpha_\beta} &= \sum\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} p(w) \left(\tfrac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)}\right)^{\alpha_1\beta} \left(\tfrac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)}\right)^{\alpha_0(1-\beta)} \\ &\leq \left(\sum\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} p(w) \left(\tfrac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)}\right)^{\alpha_1}\right)^{\beta} \left(\sum\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} p(w) \left(\tfrac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)}\right)^{\alpha_0}\right)^{(1-\beta)} \qquad = (\pi_{\alpha_1,p})^{\alpha_1\beta}(\pi_{\alpha_0,p})^{\alpha_0(1-\beta)}\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the inequality is strict unless there exists a γ such that $p(w)(\frac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)})^{\alpha_1} = \gamma p(w)(\frac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)})^{\alpha_0}$ for all w such that $p_{[1]}(w|y) > 0$. Thus inequality is strict iff there exist $w, \tilde{w} \in \mathcal{X}_p$ such that $\frac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)} > \frac{p_{[1]}(\tilde{w}|y)}{p(\tilde{w})} > 0$.

(2-d) The continuity of $\pi_{\alpha,p}$ in α on $\mathbb{R}^+$ follows from the smoothness of $\pi_{\alpha,p}$ established in part (b). In order to show the continuity on $[0,\infty]$ we need to establish the continuity at zero and at infinity. Note that x^α is a smooth function of α for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and weighted sums of smooth functions are also smooth. Thus $(\pi_{\alpha,p})^\alpha$ is a smooth function and we can use l'Hospital's rule [58, Theorem 5.13] for calculating the limits of $\pi_{\alpha,p}$ at zero and infinity:

$$\lim_{\alpha\to 0}\left(\sum\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} p(w)\left(\tfrac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)}\right)^{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} = \prod\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p}\left(\tfrac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)}\right)^{p(w)} \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad \lim_{\alpha\to 0}\pi_{\alpha,p} = \pi_{0,p} \tag{122}$$

$$\lim_{\alpha\to \infty}\left(\sum\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p} p(w)\left(\tfrac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)}\right)^{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} = \bigvee\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}_p}\tfrac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)} \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad \lim_{\alpha\to \infty}\pi_{\infty,p} = \pi_{\infty,p} \tag{123}$$

Thus $\pi_{\alpha,p}$ is continuous on $[0,\infty]$. Using the Jensen's inequality and the convexity of the function $\ln 1/x$ we get,

$$\pi'_{\alpha,p} \geq -\tfrac{\pi_{\alpha,p}}{\alpha^2}\ln\left(\sum\nolimits_{w:p_{[1]}(w|y)>0} p(w)\right) \qquad \geq 0 \tag{124}$$

Since the function $\ln 1/x$ is strictly convex, the derivative $\pi'_{\alpha,p}$ is positive unless $p(w) = p_{[1]}(w|y)$ for all $w \in \mathcal{X}_p$. Thus $\pi_{\alpha,p}$ is strictly increasing unless $p(w) = p_{[1]}(w|y)$ for all $w \in \mathcal{X}_p$.

[50] For any positive integer K, non-negative real numbers $a_\imath$ and $b_\imath$ for $\imath$ in $\{1,2,\ldots,K\}$, the function $(\sum_{\imath=1}^K a_\imath b_\imath^\alpha)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$ is a smooth function of α on $\mathbb{R}^+$, because the exponential function and the logarithm are smooth functions and composition, sum, and product of smooth functions are also smooth.

■

Proof of Lemma 3:

(3-a) For all $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ —except for a $\mu_{1,p}$-measure zero set— mean measure $\pi_{\alpha,p} : [0,\infty] \to \mathbb{R}_0^+$ is a continuous function of α by Lemma 2-(d). Thus for any sequence $\{\alpha^{(\imath)}\}$ such that $\{\alpha^{(\imath)}\} \to \alpha$ we have $\{\pi_{\alpha^{(\imath)},p}\} \to \pi_{\alpha,p}$ for $\mu_{1,p}$-a.e. Note that $\pi_{\alpha^{(\imath)},p} \leq \pi_{\infty,p}$ by Lemma 2-(d) and $\int \pi_{\infty,p}\mu_{1,p}(\mathrm{d}y) = \int \mu_{\infty,p}(\mathrm{d}y) \leq |\mathcal{X}_p|$ by Lemma 1-(a). Hence we can apply the dominated convergence theorem [7, 2.8.1], to obtain $\{\pi_{\alpha^{(\imath)},p}\} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_1(\mu_{1,p})} \pi_{\alpha,p}$, i.e.

$$\lim_{\imath\to\infty} \int \left|\pi_{\alpha^{(\imath)},p} - \pi_{\alpha,p}\right| \mu_{1,p}(\mathrm{d}y) = 0.$$

Thus $\{\mu_{\alpha^{(\imath)},p}\}$ converges to $\mu_{\alpha,p}$ in the total variation topology, for any sequence $\{\alpha^{(\imath)}\}$ such that $\{\alpha^{(\imath)}\} \to \alpha$. Then $\mu_{\alpha,p}$ is a continuous function of α from $[0,\infty]$ with its usual topology to $\mathcal{M}_0^+(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ with the total variation topology because $[0,\infty]$ with its usual topology is a metrizable space, see [53, Theorem 21.3].

(3-b) For $\mu'_{\alpha,p}$ defined in equation (10) to be a finite measure, $\pi'_{\alpha,p}$ should be a non-negative $\mu_{1,p}$-integrable function. Density $\pi'_{\alpha,p}$ is nonnegative by equation (124). By the expression for $\pi'_{\alpha,p}$ given in equation (7) we have

$$\pi'_{\alpha,p} = \tfrac{\pi_{\alpha,p}}{\alpha^2} \sum\nolimits_{w\in\mathcal{X}} p_{[\alpha]}(w|y) \ln \tfrac{p_{[\alpha]}(w|y)}{p(w)} \qquad\qquad \leq \tfrac{\pi_{\infty,p}}{\alpha^2} \ln \tfrac{1}{\wedge_{w:p(w)>0} p(w)}. \tag{125}$$

Thus $\pi'_{\alpha,p}$ is dominated by an integrable function by Lemma 1-(a) and $\mu'_{\alpha,p}$ is a finite measure, i.e. $\mu'_{\alpha,p} \in \mathcal{M}_0^+(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$. We can apply the dominated convergence theorem [7, 2.8.1] for $\mu'_{\alpha,p}$ as we did for $\mu_{\alpha,p}$ in part (a) in order to establish the continuity of $\mu'_{\alpha,p}$ as a function of α. Equation (12) follows from equation (125) by applying[51] [7, 2.8.7. Corrollary-(ii)] for $X = \mathcal{E}$.

(3-c) For $\mu''_{\alpha,p}$ defined in (11) to be a finite signed measure, $\pi''_{\alpha,p}$ should be a $\mu_{1,p}$-integrable function. By the expression for $\pi''_{\alpha,p}$ given in equation (8) we have

$$-\tfrac{2}{\alpha^3}\left(\ln \tfrac{1}{\wedge_{w:p(w)>0} p(w)}\right)\pi_{\alpha,p} \leq \pi''_{\alpha,p} \leq \tfrac{1+\alpha}{\alpha^4}\left(\ln \tfrac{1}{\wedge_{w:p(w)>0} p(w)}\right)^2 \pi_{\alpha,p} \tag{126}$$

Then $\mu''_{\alpha,p}$ is a finite signed measure, i.e. $\mu''_{\alpha,p} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$. Proof of the continuity is similar to the corresponding proofs in parts (a) and (b). Equation (13) follows from equation (126) by applying [7, 2.8.7. Corrollary-(ii)] for $X = \mathcal{E}$.

(3-d) For any $\beta \in [0,1]$ and $\alpha_0, \alpha_1 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ let α_β be $\alpha_\beta = \beta\alpha_1 + (1-\beta)\alpha_0$. Then as a result of Holder's inequality,

$$\int (\pi_{\alpha_1,p})^{\frac{\beta\alpha_1}{\alpha_\beta}} (\pi_{\alpha_0,p})^{\frac{(1-\beta)\alpha_0}{\alpha_\beta}} \mu_{1,p}(\mathrm{d}y) \leq (\|\mu_{\alpha_1,p}\|)^{\frac{\beta\alpha_1}{\alpha_\beta}} (\|\mu_{\alpha_0,p}\|)^{\frac{(1-\beta)\alpha_0}{\alpha_\beta}}. \tag{127}$$

On the other hand by Lemma 2-(c)

$$\pi_{\alpha_\beta,p} \leq (\pi_{\alpha_1,p})^{\frac{\beta\alpha_1}{\alpha_\beta}} (\pi_{\alpha_0,p})^{\frac{(1-\beta)\alpha_0}{\alpha_\beta}}. \tag{128}$$

Then the log-convexity of $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|^\alpha$ as a function of α follows from equations (127) and (128).
If $\mu_{1,p}(\cup_{\gamma\geq 1}\mathcal{A}(p,\gamma)) < 1$ then the log-convexity of $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|^\alpha$ is strict because the inequality (128) is strict for y's that are not in $\cup_{\gamma\geq 1}\mathcal{A}(p,\gamma)$ by Lemma 2-(c). For $y \in \mathcal{A}(p,\gamma)$, the inequality (128) is an equality and $\pi_{\alpha,p} = \gamma^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}$ for all α. Consequently if $\mu_{1,p}(\cup_{\gamma\geq 1}\mathcal{A}(p,\gamma)) = 1$, then the log-convexity of $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|^\alpha$ is strict iff the inequality (127) is strict. But if $\mu_{1,p}(\cup_{\gamma\geq 1}\mathcal{A}(p,\gamma)) = 1$ Holder's inequality in (127) is strict unless there exists a $\gamma \geq 1$ such that $\mu_{1,p}(\mathcal{A}(p,\gamma)) = 1$.
Now we proceed with calculating the limit at zero. As a result of the alternative expression for the density $\pi_{\alpha,p}$ given in equation (5) we have,

$$\left(\sum\nolimits_{w:p_{[1]}(w|y)>0} p(w)\right)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} \pi_{\alpha,p} = \left(\sum_w p_{[0]}(w|y)\left(\tfrac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p_{[0]}(w|y)}\right)^\alpha\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \qquad \text{where} \qquad p_{[0]}(w|y) = \tfrac{p(w)}{\sum_{\tilde{w}:p_{[1]}(\tilde{w}|y)>0} p(\tilde{w})}.$$

Then using l'Hospital's rule [58, Theorem 5.13] for calculating limits and Holder's inequality we get,

$$\lim_{\alpha\to 0}\left(\sum\nolimits_{w:p_{[1]}(w|y)>0} p(w)\right)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} \pi_{\alpha,p} = e^{\sum_w p_{[0]}(w|y)\ln\frac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p_{[0]}(w|y)}} \qquad \mu_{1,p}-a.e. \tag{129}$$

$$\left(\sum\nolimits_{w:p_{[1]}(w|y)>0} p(w)\right)^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}} \pi_{\alpha,p} \leq 1 \qquad \forall\alpha\in(0,1),\ \mu_{1,p}-a.e. \tag{130}$$

The sum $\sum_{w:p_{[1]}(w|y)>0} p(w)$ is a simple function of y, i.e. its range is a finite set, because $\mathcal{X}_p$ has finite number of distinct subsets. Thus the essential supremum is the maximum value of the sum with positive probability. Therefore

$$\mu_{1,p}\left(\left\{\sum\nolimits_{w:p_{[1]}(w|y)>0} p(w) = \psi\right\}\right) > 0 \qquad \text{where} \qquad \psi = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\mu_{1,p}} \sum\nolimits_{w:p_{[1]}(w|y)>0} p(w). \tag{131}$$

[51] One can apply Tonelli-Fubini theorem [23, 4.4.5] to obtain equivalent results, instead of invoking [7, 2.8.7. Corrollary-(ii)].

Then using equations (129) we get

$$\lim_{\alpha\to 0}\psi^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}\pi_{\alpha,p}=\mathbb{1}_{\{\sum_{w:p_{[1]}(w|y)>0}p(w)=\psi\}}e^{\sum_w p_{[0]}(w|y)\ln\frac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p_{[0]}(w|y)}}\qquad\qquad \mu_{1,p}\text{-a.e.}$$

On the other hand $\psi^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}\pi_{\alpha,p}\leq 1$ for all $\alpha\in(0,1)$, $\mu_{1,p}-$a.e. by (130) and the definition of ψ given in (131). Thus we can apply the dominated convergence theorem [7, 2.8.1]:

$$\lim_{\alpha\to 0}\int\left|\psi^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}\pi_{\alpha,p}-\mathbb{1}_{\{\sum_{w:p_{[1]}(w|y)>0}p(w)=\psi\}}e^{\sum_w p_{[0]}(w|y)\ln\frac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p_{[0]}(w|y)}}\right|\mu_{1,p}(\mathrm{d}y)=0. \tag{132}$$

Consequently,

$$\lim_{\alpha\to 0}\left(\psi^{(\alpha-1)}\|\pi_{\alpha,p}\|^{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}=\int\mathbb{1}_{\{\sum_{w:p_{[1]}(w|y)>0}p(w)=\psi\}}e^{\sum_w p_{[0]}(w|y)\ln\frac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p_{[0]}(w|y)}}\mu_{1,p}(\mathrm{d}y). \tag{133}$$

The right hand side of (133) is a real number between 0 and 1 by equation (131). Thus we have,

$$\lim_{\alpha\to 0}\psi^{\alpha-1}\|\pi_{\alpha,p}\|^{\alpha}=1. \tag{134}$$

(3-e) $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|\leq|\mathcal{X}_p|$ by Lemma 1-(a). The continuity of $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|$ in α is implied by the continuity of $\mu_{\alpha,p}$ in α for the total variation topology on $\mathcal{M}_0^+(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, proved in part (a). Furthermore, $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|=\mu_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{Y})$ because $\mu_{\alpha,p}\in\mathcal{M}_0^+(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ by part (a) and $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}\mu_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{Y})\geq 0$ by part (b). Hence $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|$ is increasing function of α.
Let $\mathcal{E}_p$ be $\mathcal{E}_p=\{y: p_{[1]}(\cdot|y)\neq p(\cdot)\}$. Then $\forall y\in\mathcal{E}_p$, $p_{[\alpha]}(\cdot|y)\neq p(\cdot)$ and $\pi_{\alpha,p}$ is strictly increasing for all $\alpha\in\mathbb{R}_0^+$. On the other hand if there are two or more distinct measures in $\mathcal{X}_p$ then $\mu_{1,p}(\mathcal{E}_p)>0$. Thus $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|$ is strictly increasing if there exist $w,\widetilde{w}\in\mathcal{X}_p$ such that $w\neq\widetilde{w}$. Else $\pi_{\alpha,p}=1$ thus $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|=\int\pi_{\alpha,p}\mu_{1,p}(\mathrm{d}y)=1$ for all $\alpha\in[0,\infty]$.

■

Proof of Lemma 4:

(4-a) Let us start with $\alpha=0$ case. Since the weighted arithmetic mean of any two non-negative real numbers is greater than their weighted geometric mean, for any reference measure ν for μ_{1,p_1} and μ_{1,p_2} we have,

$$\beta\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{0,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}+(1-\beta)\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{0,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\geq\left(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{0,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{\beta}\left(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{0,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{1-\beta}\qquad\qquad=\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{0,p_\beta}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}.$$

For any $\alpha\in(0,1]$ function $x^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$ is convex in x. Then for any reference measure ν for μ_{α,p_1} and μ_{α,p_2} as a result of the Jensen's inequality we have,

$$\beta\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}+(1-\beta)\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\geq\left(\sum\nolimits_w(\beta p_1(w)+(1-\beta)p_2(w))\left(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}w}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\qquad=\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_\beta}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}.$$

$\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|$ is convex in p because $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}$ is convex in p and $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}$ is non-negative.

(4-b) For $\alpha\in[1,\infty)$ function $x^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$ is concave in x. Thus inequalities are reversed. Hence both the Radon-Nikodym derivative $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}$ and the norm $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|$ are concave in p.
For any reference measure ν for μ_{∞,p_1} and μ_{∞,p_2} by the definition of $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\infty,p}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}$ given in (1), we have

$$\beta\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\infty,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}+(1-\beta)\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\infty,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\leq\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\infty,p_\beta}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}.$$

$\|\mu_{\infty,p}\|$ is concave in p because $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\infty,p}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}$ is concave in p and $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\infty,p}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}$ is non-negative.

(4-c) Identities given in equation (15) are confirmed using the definitions of $s_\wedge$, s_1 and s_2 by substitution. On the other hand, $\|p_1-p_2\|=\|p_1\vee p_2\|-\|p_1\wedge p_2\|=2-2\|p_1\wedge p_2\|$; and hence $s_\wedge\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}))$. Using the fist identity of (15) together with $s_\wedge\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}))$ and $p_1\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}))$ we get $s_1\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}))$. Similarly $s_2\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}))$ follows from the second identity of (15), $s_\wedge\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}))$ and $p_1\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}))$.

(4-d) Let δ be $\delta=\frac{\|p_2-p_1\|}{2}$. For any reference measure ν for μ_{α,p_1} and μ_{α,p_2} and $\alpha\in(0,1]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}-\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}&=\left[(1-\delta)(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_\wedge}}{\mathrm{d}\nu})^{\alpha}+\delta(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu})^{\alpha}\right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}-\left[(1-\delta)(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_\wedge}}{\mathrm{d}\nu})^{\alpha}+\delta(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu})^{\alpha}\right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\\&\leq\left[(1-\delta)(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_\wedge}}{\mathrm{d}\nu})^{\alpha}+\delta(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu})^{\alpha}\right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}-(1-\delta)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_\wedge}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\\&\leq\left[(1-\delta)\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_\wedge}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}+\delta\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right]-(1-\delta)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_\wedge}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}.\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the Jensen's inequality and the convexity of $x^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$ in x for $\alpha\in(0,1]$.

We bound $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} - \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}$ in a similarly way. Using these two bounds we can get a bound on $\|\mu_{\alpha,p_1} - \mu_{\alpha,p_2}\|$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mu_{\alpha,p_1} - \mu_{\alpha,p_2}\| &= \int_{\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} > \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}} (\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} - \tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu})\nu(\mathrm{d}y) + \int_{\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} > \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}} (\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} - \tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu})\nu(\mathrm{d}y) \\
&\leq \left[(1-\delta) - (1-\delta)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\right] \|\mu_{\alpha,s_\wedge}\| + \delta\|\mu_{\alpha,s_1}\| + \delta\|\mu_{\alpha,s_2}\| \\
&\leq \left[1 + \delta - (1-\delta)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\right] \\
&\leq \tfrac{1+\alpha}{\alpha}\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

(4-e) One can confirm using the derivative test that for any $\alpha \in [1,\infty)$, $x_0 \geq 0$ and $x_1 \geq x_2 \geq 0$ we have

$$[(1-\delta)x_0^\alpha + \delta x_1^\alpha]^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} - [(1-\delta)x_0^\alpha + \delta x_2^\alpha]^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \leq \delta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}(x_1 - x_2).$$

Then for any reference measure ν for μ_{α,p_1} and μ_{α,p_2},

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} - \tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} &= \left[(1-\delta)(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_\wedge}}{\mathrm{d}\nu})^\alpha + \delta(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu})^\alpha\right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} - \left[(1-\delta)(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_\wedge}}{\mathrm{d}\nu})^\alpha + \delta(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu})^\alpha\right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \\
&\leq \delta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\left[\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} - \tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

We can bound $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} - \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}$ in a similarly way. On the other hand $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} \geq \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}$ iff $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} \geq \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}$. Thus we can bound $\|\mu_{\alpha,p_1} - \mu_{\alpha,p_2}\|$ using the bounds on $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} - \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}$ and $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} - \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mu_{\alpha,p_1} - \mu_{\alpha,p_2}\| &= \int_{\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} > \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}} (\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} - \tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu})\nu(\mathrm{d}y) + \int_{\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} > \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}} (\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} - \tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu})\nu(\mathrm{d}y) \\
&\leq \delta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \int_{\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} > \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}} (\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} - \tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu})\nu(\mathrm{d}y) + \delta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \int_{\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} > \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu}} (\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_2}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} - \tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,s_1}}{\mathrm{d}\nu})\nu(\mathrm{d}y) \\
&= \delta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}\|\mu_{\alpha,s_1} - \mu_{\alpha,s_2}\|.
\end{aligned}$$

■

B. Proofs of The Lemmas on The Renyi Information

Proof of Lemma 5: $I_0(\alpha;\mathcal{W}) \geq 0$ because $\sum_{w:p_{[1]}(w|y)>0} p(w) \leq \sum_w p(w) = 1$. $\lim_{\alpha\downarrow 0} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) = I_0(p;\mathcal{W})$ follows from equation (14) and the definition of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ given in equation (18).

$I_\infty(\alpha;\mathcal{W}) \leq \ln|\mathcal{X}_p|$ because $\|\mu_{\infty,p}\| \leq |\mathcal{X}_p|$ by Lemma 3-(e). $\lim_{\alpha\uparrow\infty} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) = I_\infty(p;\mathcal{W})$ follows from the continuity of $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|$ at infinity, i.e. Lemma 3-(e), and the definition of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ given in equation (18).

Both $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|$ and $\|\mu'_{\alpha,p}\|$ are continuously differentiable on $\mathbb{R}^+$, $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\| = \|\mu'_{\alpha,p}\|$ and $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}\|\mu'_{\alpha,p}\| = \mu''_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{Y})$ because of Lemma 3-(a,b,c). Then as a result of its definition given in equation (18), $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ is continuously differentiable on $(0,1)$ and $(1,\infty)$. Expression for the derivative for $\alpha \neq 1$ given in equation (21) follows from the chain rule.

In order to extend the continuous differentiability to $\alpha = 1$, first we establish that $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ is continuous at $\alpha = 1$. As a result of l'Hospital's rule [58, Theorem 5.13] and Lemma 3-(b) $\lim_{\alpha\to 1} \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\ln\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\| = \|\mu'_{1,p}\|$. On the other hand $\|\mu'_{1,p}\| = I_1(p;\mathcal{W})$ as result of equations (7), (10) and the definition of $I_1(p;\mathcal{W})$. Thus $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ is continuous at $\alpha = 1$. Then,

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})\big|_{\alpha=1} = \lim_{\alpha\to 1} \tfrac{1}{1-\alpha}\left[\|\mu'_{1,p}\| - \tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\ln\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|\right].$$

$\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|$ and $\|\mu'_{\alpha,p}\|$ are continuously differentiable by Lemma 3-(b,c). Then using l'Hospital's rule [58, Theorem 5.13] and the identity $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}\|\mu'_{\alpha,p}\| = \mu''_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{Y})$ we get

$$\lim_{\alpha\to 1} \tfrac{1}{1-\alpha}\left[\|\mu'_{1,p}\| - \tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\ln\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|\right] = \tfrac{1}{2}\left[\mu''_{1,p}(\mathcal{Y}) + 2\|\mu'_{1,p}\| - \|\mu'_{1,p}\|^2\right].$$

Hence $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ is differentiable at $\alpha = 1$ and its derivative at $\alpha = 1$ is the one given in equation (21). Finally, in order to show that $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ is continuous at $\alpha = 1$ we apply l'Hospital's rule [58, Theorem 5.13] to confirm,

$$\lim_{\alpha\to 1} \tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}) = \lim_{\alpha\to 1} \tfrac{\alpha(\alpha-1)\|\mu'_{\alpha,p}\| - \|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|\ln\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|}{\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|(\alpha-1)^2} \qquad = \tfrac{1}{2}\left[\mu''_{1,p}(\mathcal{Y}) + 2\|\mu'_{1,p}\| - \|\mu'_{1,p}\|^2\right].$$

As a function α on $(0,\infty)$, $\alpha\ln\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|$ is convex by Lemma 3-(d) and differentiable by Lemma 3-(b). Then $\alpha\ln\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|$ has a tangent at each $\alpha \in (0,\infty)$ and it lays above all of its tangents, i.e. for all $\alpha, z \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\alpha \neq z$,

$$z\ln\|\mu_{z,p}\| \geq \alpha\ln\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\| + \left(\ln\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\| + \tfrac{\alpha\|\mu'_{\alpha,p}\|}{\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|}\right)(z-\alpha) \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad \tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-z}\tfrac{\|\mu'_{\alpha,p}\|}{\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|} + \tfrac{z}{(\alpha-z)^2}\ln\tfrac{\|\mu_{z,p}\|}{\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|} \geq 0 \qquad (135)$$

If we apply above inequality at $z=1$ we can conclude, using equation (21), that $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})\geq 0$ for $\alpha\neq 1$. For $\alpha=1$ using Lemma 2-(b) and Lemma 3-(c) we get

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})\big|_{\alpha=1}=\tfrac{1}{2}\int\sum_w p_{[1]}(w|y)\left(\ln\tfrac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)}-I_1(p;\mathcal{W})\right)^2\mu_{1,p}(\mathrm{d}y)\qquad\geq 0. \tag{136}$$

Thus $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ is non-negative for all $\alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+$ and $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ is an increasing function of α.

If $\mu_{1,p}(\mathcal{A}(p,\gamma))=1$ for a γ, then $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|=\gamma^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}$ for all $\alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+$ and $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})=\ln\gamma$ for all $\alpha\in[0,\infty]$, because $\pi_{\alpha,p}=\gamma^{\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}}$ for all $y\in\mathcal{A}(p,\gamma)$.

If there does not exist a γ such that $\mu_{1,p}(\mathcal{A}(p,\gamma))=1$, then the convexity of $\alpha\ln\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|$ is strict by Lemma 3-(d) and the variance of the random variable $\ln\frac{p_{[1]}(w|y)}{p(w)}$ is positive. Thus the inequalities (135) and (136) are strict and $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ is positive for all $\alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+$. ■

Proof of Lemma 6:

(6-a) Let us start with the values of α in $(0,1)$. Recall that $\|\cdot\|:\mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})\to\mathbb{R}^+$ and $\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\ln(\cdot):\mathbb{R}^+\to\mathbb{R}$ are continuous functions and the composition of two continuous functions is a continuous function, [53, Theorem 18.2.c]. Furthermore, the function $\mu_{\alpha,p}:\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})\to\mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ is continuous for $\alpha\in(0,1)$ by Lemma 4-(d). Thus $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W}):\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})\to\mathbb{R}^+$ is a continuous function of p for $\alpha\in(0,1)$.
$\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|$ is convex in p for $\alpha\in(0,1)$ by Lemma 4-(a). Then by the definition of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ given in (18) for any $p_1,p_2\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ and $\beta\in[0,1]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}I_\alpha(p_\beta;\mathcal{W})&\geq\tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\ln\left(\beta\|\mu_{\alpha,p_1}\|+(1-\beta)\|\mu_{\alpha,p_2}\|\right)\qquad&\geq\tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\ln\left(\|\mu_{\alpha,p_1}\|\vee\|\mu_{\alpha,p_2}\|\right)\\&\geq I_\alpha(p_1;\mathcal{W})\wedge I_\alpha(p_2;\mathcal{W})\,.\end{aligned}$$

Thus Renyi information is continuous and quasi-concave in p for $\alpha\in(0,1)$.
For $\alpha=0$ case, first note that $\left|e^{-I_0(p_1;\mathcal{W})}-e^{-I_0(p_2;\mathcal{W})}\right|\leq\|p_1-p_2\|$. Thus $e^{-I_0(p;\mathcal{W})}$ is continuous in p. Since $-\ln(\cdot):\mathbb{R}^+\to\mathbb{R}$ is continuous, $I_0(p;\mathcal{W})$ is continuous in p. In order to prove that $I_0(p;\mathcal{W})$ is quasi concave, note that for any $\beta\in(0,1)$ and $p_1,p_2\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned}I_0(p_\beta;\mathcal{W})&=-\ln\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\mu_{1,p_\beta}}\left(\beta\sum\nolimits_{w:p_1(w|y)>0}p_1(w)+(1-\beta)\sum\nolimits_{w:p_2(w|y)>0}p_2(w)\right)\\&\geq-\ln\left(\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\mu_{1,p_1}}\left(\sum\nolimits_{w:p_1(w|y)>0}p_1(w)\right)\bigvee\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\mu_{1,p_2}}\left(\sum\nolimits_{w:p_2(w|y)>0}p_2(w)\right)\right)\\&=I_0(p_1;\mathcal{W})\wedge I_0(p_2;\mathcal{W})\,.\end{aligned}$$

(6-b) $\|\mu_{\alpha,p}\|$ is concave in p for $\alpha\in(1,\infty]$ by Lemma 4-(b). Then by the definition of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ given in (18) for any $p_1,p_2\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ and $\beta\in[0,1]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}I_\alpha(p_\beta;\mathcal{W})&\geq\tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\ln\left(\beta\|\mu_{\alpha,p_1}\|+(1-\beta)\|\mu_{\alpha,p_2}\|\right)\qquad&\geq\beta\tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\ln\|\mu_{\alpha,p_1}\|+(1-\beta)\tfrac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\ln\|\mu_{\alpha,p_2}\|\\&=\beta I_\alpha(p_1;\mathcal{W})+(1-\beta)I_\alpha(p_2;\mathcal{W})\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the Jensen's inequality and the concavity of the logarithm function.
For $\alpha=1$ case, note that as a result of definition of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}I_1(p_\beta;\mathcal{W})&=\beta I_1(p_1;\mathcal{W})+(1-\beta)I_1(p_2;\mathcal{W})+\int\left[\beta\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p_\beta}}\ln\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p_\beta}}+(1-\beta)\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p_\beta}}\ln\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p_\beta}}\right]\mu_{1,p_\beta}(\mathrm{d}y)\\&\geq\beta I_1(p_1;\mathcal{W})+(1-\beta)I_1(p_2;\mathcal{W})\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from $\beta\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p_1}}{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p_\beta}}+(1-\beta)\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p_2}}{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p_\beta}}=1$, the convexity of the function $x\ln x$ and the Jensen's inequality.

■

C. Proofs of The Lemmas on The Renyi Divergence

Proof of Lemma 7: Since the pointwise supremum of any collection of lower semicontinuous functions is a lower semicontinuous function and $D_\alpha(\mu\|\,q)=\sup_{\mathcal{E}}D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\,q)$ by definition, $D_\alpha(\mu\|\,q)$ is lower semicontinuous if $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\,q)$ is lower semicontinuous for any finite partition $\mathcal{E}$ of $\mathcal{Y}$ measurable in $\mathcal{Y}$.

For any $\mu,q\in\mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, finite partition $\mathcal{E}$ of $\mathcal{Y}$ measurable in $\mathcal{Y}$ and $\delta>0$, let $\mathcal{N}_\delta^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu,q)$ be

$$\mathcal{N}_\delta^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu,q)\triangleq\{(\widetilde{\mu},\widetilde{q}):\widetilde{\mu},\widetilde{q}\in\mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}),\ \vee_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}}\,|\mu(\mathcal{E})-\widetilde{\mu}(\mathcal{E})|<\delta\text{ and }\vee_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}}\,|q(\mathcal{E})-\widetilde{q}(\mathcal{E})|<\delta\}. \tag{137}$$

$\mathcal{N}_\delta^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu,q)$ is an open set because $\mathcal{N}_\delta^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu,q)$ is the intersection of finite number of open sets. In order establish the lower semicontinuity of $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$, we prove that for any γ such that $\gamma < D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$ there exists a δ such that if $(\widetilde{\mu},\widetilde{q}) \in \mathcal{N}_\delta^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu,q)$ then $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\widetilde{\mu}\|\,\widetilde{q}) \in (\gamma,\infty]$. Let ϱ be

$$\varrho = \left(\wedge_{\mathcal{E}:\mu(\mathcal{E})>0}\mu(\mathcal{E})\right) \wedge \left(\wedge_{\mathcal{E}:q(\mathcal{E})>0}q(\mathcal{E})\right).$$

- If $\alpha \in (0,1)$ for any $(\widetilde{\mu},\widetilde{q}) \in \mathcal{N}_{\epsilon\varrho}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu,q)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} \widetilde{\mu}(\mathcal{E})^\alpha \widetilde{q}(\mathcal{E})^{1-\alpha} &\le (1+\epsilon)\sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} \mu(\mathcal{E})^\alpha q(\mathcal{E})^{1-\alpha} + \sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}:\mu(\mathcal{E})q(\mathcal{E})=0} \widetilde{\mu}(\mathcal{E})^\alpha \widetilde{q}(\mathcal{E})^{1-\alpha} \\ &\le (1+\epsilon)\sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} \mu(\mathcal{E})^\alpha q(\mathcal{E})^{1-\alpha} + (\epsilon^\alpha + \epsilon^{1-\alpha})\|\mu\|^\alpha \|q\|^{1-\alpha}|\mathcal{E}|.\end{aligned}$$

  Hence,

$$D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\widetilde{\mu}\|\,\widetilde{q}) \ge \tfrac{1}{\alpha-1}\ln\left((1+\epsilon)e^{(\alpha-1)D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|q)} + (\epsilon^\alpha+\epsilon^{1-\alpha})\|\mu\|^\alpha\|q\|^{1-\alpha}|\mathcal{E}|\right).$$

- If $\alpha = 1$ and $\epsilon\varrho \le (1+e)^{-1}$ for any $(\widetilde{\mu},\widetilde{q}) \in \mathcal{N}_{\epsilon\varrho}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu,q)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}D_1^{\mathcal{E}}(\widetilde{\mu}\|\,\widetilde{q}) \ge & \sum_{\mathcal{E}:\mu(\mathcal{E})>0,q(\mathcal{E})=0} \widetilde{\mu}(\mathcal{E})\ln\tfrac{\widetilde{\mu}(\mathcal{E})}{\epsilon\varrho} + \sum_{\mathcal{E}:\mu(\mathcal{E})q(\mathcal{E})>0} \mu(\mathcal{E})\ln\tfrac{\widetilde{\mu}(\mathcal{E})}{\widetilde{q}(\mathcal{E})} - \sum_{\mathcal{E}:\mu(\mathcal{E})q(\mathcal{E})>0} |\widetilde{\mu}(\mathcal{E})-\mu(\mathcal{E})|\left|\ln\tfrac{\widetilde{\mu}(\mathcal{E})}{\widetilde{q}(\mathcal{E})}\right| \\ & + \sum_{\mathcal{E}:\mu(\mathcal{E})=0,q(\mathcal{E})>0} \epsilon\varrho\ln\tfrac{\epsilon\varrho}{(1+\epsilon)\|q\|} + \sum_{\mathcal{E}:\mu(\mathcal{E})=0,q(\mathcal{E})=0} \widetilde{q}(\mathcal{E})(-\tfrac{1}{e}) \\ \ge & \sum_{\mathcal{E}:\mu(\mathcal{E})>0,q(\mathcal{E})=0} \mu(\mathcal{E})(1-\epsilon)\ln\tfrac{1-\epsilon}{\epsilon} + \sum_{\mathcal{E}:\mu(\mathcal{E})q(\mathcal{E})>0} \mu(\mathcal{E})\ln\tfrac{\mu(\mathcal{E})}{q(\mathcal{E})} + \|\mu\|\ln\tfrac{1-\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} + \epsilon\varrho|\mathcal{E}|\ln\tfrac{(1-\epsilon)\varrho}{\|\mu\|+\|q\|+\epsilon\varrho} \\ & + \epsilon\varrho|\mathcal{E}|\ln\tfrac{\epsilon\varrho}{(1+\epsilon)\|q\|} - \tfrac{\epsilon\varrho}{e}|\mathcal{E}|.\end{aligned}$$

- If $\alpha \in (1,\infty)$ for any $(\widetilde{\mu},\widetilde{q}) \in \mathcal{N}_{\epsilon\varrho}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu,q)$ we have

$$\sum_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} \widetilde{\mu}(\mathcal{E})^\alpha \widetilde{q}(\mathcal{E})^{1-\alpha} \ge (1-\epsilon)^\alpha(1+\epsilon)^{1-\alpha} \sum_{\mathcal{E}:q(\mathcal{E})>0} \mu(\mathcal{E})^\alpha q(\mathcal{E})^{1-\alpha} + (1-\epsilon)^\alpha \sum_{\mathcal{E}:q(\mathcal{E})=0} \mu(\mathcal{E})^\alpha(\epsilon\varrho)^{1-\alpha}.$$

  Hence,

$$D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\widetilde{\mu}\|\,\widetilde{q}) \ge \begin{cases} D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q) + \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}\ln(1-\epsilon) - \ln(1+\epsilon) & \text{if } D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q) < \infty \\ \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\ln\left(\frac{(1-\epsilon)^\alpha}{\epsilon^{\alpha-1}}\varrho\right) & \text{if } D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q) = \infty \end{cases}.$$

- If $\alpha = \infty$ for any $(\widetilde{\mu},\widetilde{q}) \in \mathcal{N}_{\epsilon\varrho}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu,q)$ we have

$$\bigvee\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} \tfrac{\widetilde{\mu}(\mathcal{E})}{\widetilde{q}(\mathcal{E})} \ge \left(\bigvee\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}:q(\mathcal{E})>0} \tfrac{\mu(\mathcal{E})}{q(\mathcal{E})}\tfrac{1-\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}\right) \bigvee \left(\bigvee\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}:q(\mathcal{E})=0} \tfrac{\mu(\mathcal{E})(1-\epsilon)}{\epsilon\varrho}\right).$$

  Hence,

$$D_\infty^{\mathcal{E}}(\widetilde{\mu}\|\,\widetilde{q}) \ge \begin{cases} D_\infty^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q) + \ln\frac{1-\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} & \text{if } D_\infty^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q) < \infty \\ \ln\left(\frac{1-\epsilon}{\epsilon}\right) & \text{if } D_\infty^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q) = \infty \end{cases}.$$

In all cases, the lower bound can be made as tight as we please by taking a small enough ϵ. ■

Proof of Lemma 8: We denote the right hand side of equation (25) by $\widetilde{D}_\alpha(\mu\|\, q)$. The integral $\int \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^\alpha \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{1-\alpha} \nu(\mathrm{d}y)$ is always defined because it is the integral of a non-negative function. The integral $\int \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\left(\ln\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu} - \ln\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)\nu(\mathrm{d}y)$ is always defined, as well, because $\int_{\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}<\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}} \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\left(\ln\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu} - \ln\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)\nu(\mathrm{d}y) \ge -\frac{\|q\|}{e}$. Hence the function $\widetilde{D}_\alpha(\mu\|\, q)$ is well defined.

Let us first prove that for any $\mathcal{Y}$ measurable finite partition $\mathcal{E}$

$$\widetilde{D}_\alpha(\mu\|\, q) \ge D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q). \tag{138}$$

- For $\alpha = 0$ case, $q(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu} > 0) \le \sum_{\mathcal{E}:\mu(\mathcal{E})>0} q(\mathcal{E})$ because $\{y : \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu} > 0\} \subset \cup_{\mathcal{E}:\mu(\mathcal{E})>0}\mathcal{E}$.
- For $\alpha \in (0,1)$ case, $\int_{\mathcal{E}} \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^\alpha \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{1-\alpha} \nu(\mathrm{d}y) \le \mu(\mathcal{E})^\alpha q(\mathcal{E})^{1-\alpha}$ by Holder's inequality.
- For $\alpha \ge 1$ case,
  - If $\mu \not\prec q$ then $\widetilde{D}_\alpha(\mu\|\, q) = \infty$.
  - If $\mu \prec q$ then we need to analyze three cases separately
    - For $\alpha = 1$ case, $\int_{\mathcal{E}} \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\ln\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu/\mathrm{d}\nu}{\mathrm{d}q/\mathrm{d}\nu}\nu(\mathrm{d}y) \ge \mu(\mathcal{E})\ln\frac{\mu(\mathcal{E})}{q(\mathcal{E})}$ by the convexity of the function $x\ln x$ and the Jensen's inequality.

$*$ For $\alpha \in (1,\infty)$ case, $\int_{\mathcal{E}} \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{\alpha} \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{1-\alpha} \nu(\mathrm{d}y) \geq \mu(\mathcal{E})^{\alpha} q(\mathcal{E})^{1-\alpha}$ by reverse Holder's inequality.

$*$ For $\alpha = \infty$ case, $ess\sup_{\mu}(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}/\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}) \geq \frac{\mu(\mathcal{E})}{q(\mathcal{E})}$ for any $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{Y}$ by the definition of essential supremum.

The inequality (138) follows from the definitions of $D_{\alpha}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu \| q)$ and $\widetilde{D}_{\alpha}(\mu \| q)$.

Now we are left with establishing

$$\widetilde{D}_{\alpha}(\mu \| q) \leq \sup_{\mathcal{E}} D_{\alpha}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu \| q)\,. \tag{139}$$

For that we construct a specific sequence of partitions $\{\mathcal{E}^{(\imath)}\}$, which depends on (μ, q) pair, and show that

$$\widetilde{D}_{\alpha}(\mu \| q) \leq \liminf_{\imath \to \infty} D_{\alpha}^{\mathcal{E}^{(\imath)}}(\mu \| q)\,. \tag{140}$$

The sequence of partitions $\{\mathcal{E}^{(\imath)}\}$ will satisfy equation (26) as a result of equations (138) and (140).

$$\mathcal{E}_{\jmath}^{(\imath)} \triangleq \begin{cases} \{y : \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu} = 0\} & \jmath = 0 \\ \{y : (\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}/\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}) \in (0, (\imath+1)2^{-\imath}]\} & \jmath = 1 \\ \{y : (\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}/\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}) \in ((\imath+\jmath-1)2^{-\imath}, (\imath+\jmath)2^{-\imath}]\} & \jmath \in \{2, \ldots, (\imath 2^{\imath} - \imath)\} \\ \{y : (\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}/\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}) \in (\imath, \infty)\} & \jmath = \imath 2^{\imath} - \imath + 1 \\ \{y : \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu} > 0 \text{ and } \frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu} = 0\} & \jmath = \imath 2^{\imath} - \imath + 2 \end{cases} \tag{141}$$

- For $\alpha = 0$ case, $\widetilde{D}_0(\mu \| q) = D_0^{\mathcal{E}^{(\imath)}}(\mu \| q)$ for all $\imath$ because

$$q\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu} > 0\right) = \sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{E}^{(\imath)} : \mu(\mathcal{E}) > 0} q(\mathcal{E}). \tag{142}$$

- For $\alpha \in (0,1)$ case, first note that

$$\int \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{\alpha} \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{1-\alpha} \nu(\mathrm{d}y) = \int_{\mathcal{Y} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\imath 2^{\imath} - \imath + 2}^{(\imath)}} \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{\alpha} \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{1-\alpha} \nu(\mathrm{d}y) \qquad = \int (\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}/\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu})^{\alpha} \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{Y} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\imath 2^{\imath} - \imath + 2}^{(\imath)}\}} q(\mathrm{d}y). \tag{143}$$

As a result of the definition of $\mathcal{E}_{\jmath}^{(\imath)}$ given in equation (141),

$$(\tfrac{\imath+\jmath-1}{2^{\imath}})^{\alpha} q(\mathcal{E}_{\jmath}^{(\imath)}) \leq \mu(\mathcal{E}_{\jmath}^{(\imath)})^{\alpha} q(\mathcal{E}_{\jmath}^{(\imath)})^{1-\alpha} \leq (\tfrac{\imath+\jmath}{2^{\imath}})^{\alpha} q(\mathcal{E}_{\jmath}^{(\imath)}) \qquad \forall \jmath \in \{2, \ldots, (\imath 2^{\imath} - \imath + 1)\}. \tag{144}$$

On the other hand by the definition of $\mathcal{E}_{\jmath}^{(\imath)}$ and Markov inequality

$$\mu(\mathcal{E}_1^{(\imath)}) \leq \tfrac{\imath+1}{2^{\imath}} q(\mathcal{E}_1^{(\imath)}) \leq \tfrac{\imath+1}{2^{\imath}} \|q\| \tag{145}$$

$$q(\mathcal{E}_{\imath 2^{\imath} - \imath + 1}^{(\imath)}) \leq \tfrac{1}{\imath} \mu(\mathcal{E}_{\imath 2^{\imath} - \imath + 1}^{(\imath)}) \leq \tfrac{1}{\imath} \|\mu\| \tag{146}$$

Since $(\jmath + \imath)(1 - \frac{1}{\imath}) \leq (\jmath + \imath - 1)$ for $\imath \geq 1$ and $\jmath \geq 0$, using the definition of $D_{\alpha}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu \| q)$ given in equation (23) and equations (144), (145), (146) we get

$$(1 - \tfrac{1}{\imath})^{\alpha} \left[e^{(\alpha-1) D_{\alpha}^{\mathcal{E}^{(\imath)}}(\mu \| q)} - \left(\tfrac{\imath+1}{2^{\imath}}\right)^{\alpha} \|q\| - \left(\tfrac{1}{\imath}\right)^{1-\alpha} \|\mu\| \right] \leq \int f^{(\imath)} q(\mathrm{d}y) \leq e^{(\alpha-1) D_{\alpha}^{\mathcal{E}^{(\imath)}}(\mu \| q)} \tag{147}$$

where for each $\imath$ simple function $f^{(\imath)}$ is given by

$$f^{(\imath)}(y) = \sum\nolimits_{\jmath=2}^{\imath 2^{\imath} - \imath} \mathbb{1}_{\{y \in \mathcal{E}_{\jmath}^{(\imath)}\}} (\tfrac{\jmath+\imath}{2^{\imath}}(1 - \tfrac{1}{\imath}))^{\alpha}. \tag{148}$$

Note that $f^{(\imath)} \uparrow (\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}/\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu})^{\alpha} \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{Y} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\imath 2^{\imath} - \imath + 2}^{(\imath)}\}}$. Then by the monotone convergence theorem [7, 2.8.2],

$$\int f^{(\imath)} q(\mathrm{d}y) \uparrow \int (\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}/\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu})^{\alpha} \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{Y} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\imath 2^{\imath} - \imath + 2}^{(\imath)}\}} q(\mathrm{d}y). \tag{149}$$

The equations (143), (147) and (149) implies $\lim_{\imath \to \infty} D_{\alpha}^{\mathcal{E}^{(\imath)}}(\mu \| q) = \widetilde{D}_{\alpha}(\mu \| q)$. Hence the inequality in (140) holds.

- For $\alpha \geq 1$ case, first note that if $\mu(\mathcal{E}_{\imath 2^{\imath} - \imath + 2}^{(\imath)}) > 0$ then $D_{\alpha}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu \| q) = \infty$ by the definition of $D_{\alpha}^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu \| q)$ given in (23). Then equation (140) holds trivially. If $\mu(\mathcal{E}_{\imath 2^{\imath} - \imath + 2}^{(\imath)}) = 0$ then $\mu \prec q$ and we need to analyze three cases separately.
  - $\mu \prec q$ and $\alpha = 1$ case:

$$\int \tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu} \left[\ln \tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu} - \ln \tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu} \right] \nu(\mathrm{d}y) = \int \left[(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}/\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}) \ln (\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}/\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}) \right] q(\mathrm{d}y) \tag{150}$$

$$\int g^{(\imath)} q(\mathrm{d}y) \leq D_1^{\mathcal{E}^{(\imath)}}(\mu \| q) \tag{151}$$

where for each $\imath$ simple function $g^{(\imath)}$ is given by

$$g^{(\imath)}(y) = \mathbb{1}_{\{y\in\mathcal{E}_1^{(\imath)}\}} \min_{x\in[0,(\imath+1)2^{-\imath}]} x\ln x + \sum\nolimits_{\jmath=2}^{\imath 2^\imath-\imath} \mathbb{1}_{\{y\in\mathcal{E}_\jmath^{(\imath)}\}} \min_{x\in[(\imath+\jmath-1)2^{-\imath},(\imath+\jmath)2^{-\imath}]} x\ln x. \tag{152}$$

Note that $g^{(\imath)} \uparrow (\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}q}\ln\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}q})$ by the construction. Furthermore, $x\ln x \geq -e^{-1}$ for all $x\in\mathbb{R}^+$. Then using the monotone convergence theorem [7, 2.8.2] we get

$$\int g^{(\imath)} q(\mathrm{d}y) \uparrow \widetilde{D}_1(\mu\|\, q)\,. \tag{153}$$

The inequality in (140) follows from (150), (151) and (153).

– $\mu\prec q$ and $\alpha\in(1,\infty)$ case:

$$\int \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^\alpha \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{1-\alpha} \nu(\mathrm{d}y) = \int (\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}/\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu})^\alpha q(\mathrm{d}y). \tag{154}$$

Furthermore, $f^{(\imath)} \uparrow (\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}/\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu})^\alpha$ for $f^{(\imath)}$ defined in (148); using the monotone convergence theorem [7, 2.8.2] we get

$$\int f^{(\imath)} q(\mathrm{d}y) \uparrow \int (\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}/\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu})^\alpha q(\mathrm{d}y). \tag{155}$$

On the other hand $\int f^{(\imath)} q(\mathrm{d}y) \leq e^{(\alpha-1)D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}^{(\imath)}}(\mu\|q)}$. Thus the inequality in (140) holds.

– $\mu\prec q$ and $\alpha=\infty$ case: If $\mu(\mathcal{E}^{(\imath)}_{\imath 2^\imath-\imath+1})>0$ then $D_\infty^{\mathcal{E}^{(\imath)}}(\mu\|\, q)\geq \ln\imath$ by the definition of $D_\infty^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$ given in equation (23). Therefore, if $\mu(\mathcal{E}^{(\imath)}_{\imath 2^\imath-\imath+1})$ is positive for all $\imath$ then $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} D_\infty^{\mathcal{E}^{(\imath)}}(\mu\|\, q)=\infty$ and the inequality in (140) holds trivially.

If there exists a κ for which $\mu(\mathcal{E}^{(\kappa)}_{\kappa 2^\kappa-\kappa+1})=0$ then the essential supremum of $(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}/\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu})$ is bounded above by κ, i.e.

$$ess\sup_\nu (\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}/\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}) \leq \kappa. \tag{156}$$

Then for all $\imath\geq\kappa$ there exists $\jmath$ such that

$$\max_{\jmath:\mu(\mathcal{E}_\jmath^{(\imath)})>0} \tfrac{\imath+\jmath-1}{2^\imath} \leq ess\sup_\nu (\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}/\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}) \leq \max_{\jmath:\mu(\mathcal{E}_\jmath^{(\imath)})>0} \tfrac{\imath+\jmath}{2^\imath} \tag{157}$$

If there exists a κ for which $\mu(\mathcal{E}^{(\kappa)}_{\kappa 2^\kappa-\kappa+1})=0$ then $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} D_\infty^{\mathcal{E}^{(\imath)}}(\mu\|\, q) = \lim_{\imath\to\infty}\widetilde{D}_\infty(\mu\|\, q)$ by the definition $D_\infty^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$ and $\widetilde{D}_\infty(\mu\|\, q)$. Consequently the inequality in (140) holds.

■

Proof of Lemma 9: Let ν be a reference measure for μ, q and s.

(9-a) For any $\mathcal{Y}$ measurable finite partition $\mathcal{E}$, $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$ is a continuous function on $[0,\infty]$. Since the pointwise supremum of a family of continuous functions lower semicontinuous, $D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q)$ is a lower semicontinuous function on $[0,\infty]$.

For any $\mathcal{Y}$ measurable finite partition $\mathcal{E}$, $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$ is a continuous function on $[0,1)$, which is continuously differentiable function on $(0,1)$. Using l'Hospital's rule [58, Theorem 5.13] one can confirm that $\lim_{\alpha\uparrow 1} D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q) = D_1^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$. Thus $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$ is a continuous function on $[0,1]$. On the other hand,

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha} D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q) = \tfrac{1}{(\alpha-1)^2}\sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} v_\alpha(\mathcal{E})\ln\tfrac{v_\alpha(\mathcal{E})}{\mu(\mathcal{E})} \qquad \text{where} \qquad v_\alpha(\mathcal{E}) = \tfrac{(\mu(\mathcal{E}))^\alpha (q(\mathcal{E}))^{1-\alpha}}{\sum_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}\in\mathcal{E}}(\mu(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}))^\alpha (q(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}))^{1-\alpha}}. \tag{158}$$

Hence $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha} D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)\geq 0$ by the Jensen's inequality for all $\alpha\in(0,1)$. Thus $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$ is an increasing continuous function on $[0,1]$.

If there exists a $\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}$ such that $\mu(\mathcal{E})>0$ and $q(\mathcal{E})=0$ then $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)=\infty$ for all $\alpha\in[1,\infty]$. Otherwise $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$ is a continuously differentiable function on $(1,\infty)$ and using l'Hospital's rule [58, Theorem 5.13] one can confirm that $\lim_{\alpha\downarrow 1} D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q) = D_1^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$ and $\lim_{\alpha\uparrow\infty} D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q) = D_\infty^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$. Thus $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$ is a continuous function on $[1,\infty]$, as well. On the other hand using (158) we can conclude, as we did for $\alpha\in[0,1]$ case, that $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$ is an increasing function on $[1,\infty]$. Thus $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$ is an increasing continuous function of α on $[0,\infty]$. Furthermore, $(\alpha-1)D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$ is a convex function of α because its twice differentiable and its second derivative is non-negative:

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}\alpha^2}((\alpha-1)D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)) = \sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} v_\alpha(\mathcal{E})\left[\ln\tfrac{v_\alpha(\mathcal{E})}{\mu(\mathcal{E})} - \sum\nolimits_{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}\in\mathcal{E}} v_\alpha(\tilde{\mathcal{E}})\ln\tfrac{v_\alpha(\tilde{\mathcal{E}})}{\mu(\tilde{\mathcal{E}})}\right]^2.$$

$D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q)$ is increasing in α because it is defined as the supremum of increasing functions. In addition, $D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q)$ is lower semicontinuous in α because it is defined as the supremum of continuous functions.

On the other hand, $D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q) = -\ln\|q\| + \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} D_{1-\alpha}(q/\|q\|\|\,\mu)$ for $\alpha\in(0,1)$ as a result of the definition of Renyi divergence. Then as a function of the order α both $D_{1-\alpha}(q/\|q\|\|\,\mu)$ and $D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q)$ are continuous from the right on $(0,1)$ because $D_{1-\alpha}(q/\|q\|\|\,\mu)$ is a decreasing and lower semicontinuous function of the order α. The Renyi divergence

$D_\alpha(\mu\| q)$ is an upper semicontinuous function of the order α on $(0,1)$, as well, because it is increasing on $(0,1)$. Thus as a function of the order $D_\alpha(\mu\| q)$ is continuous on $(0,1]$. In order to extend the continuity to $[0,1]$ we need to prove that $\lim_{\alpha\downarrow 0} D_\alpha(\mu\| q) = D_0(\mu\| q)$. Let $\{\alpha^{(\imath)}\}$ be a sequence converging to zero.[52] Then

$$\left(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{\alpha^{(\imath)}}\left(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{1-\alpha^{(\imath)}} \xrightarrow{\nu-a.e.} \mathbb{1}_{\{\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}>0\}}\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \left(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{\alpha^{(\imath)}}\left(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\right)^{1-\alpha^{(\imath)}} \leq \tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}+\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}.$$

Since $\int(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}+\frac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu})\nu(\mathrm{d}y)<\infty$ as a result of the dominated convergence theorem [7, 2.8.1] we have

$$\lim_{\imath\to\infty}\int(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu})^{\alpha^{(\imath)}}(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu})^{1-\alpha^{(\imath)}}\nu(\mathrm{d}y)=\int\mathbb{1}_{\{\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}>0\}}\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}\nu(\mathrm{d}y).$$

Hence, $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} D_{\alpha^{(\imath)}}(\mu\| q) = D_0(\mu\| q)$ by the alternative expression for Renyi divergence given in (25). Thus $D_\alpha(\mu\| q)$ is continuous in α on $[0,1]$.

If $D_z(\mu\| q)$ is finite for a $z>1$ then we can extend the continuity to $[0,\chi_{\mu,q}]$ by proving the continuity on $(1,\chi_{\mu,q}]$ and the continuity from right at $\alpha=1$. First note that $(\alpha-1)D_\alpha(\mu\| q)$ is finite for all α in $[1,z]$. $(\alpha-1)D_\alpha(\mu\| q)$ is also convex in α on $[1,z]$ because because it is the pointwise supremum of convex functions. Then $(\alpha-1)D_\alpha(\mu\| q)$ is continuous in α on $(1,z)$ by [23, Theorem 6.3.3]. The continuity of $(\alpha-1)D_\alpha(\mu\| q)$ on $(1,z)$ implies the continuity of $D_\alpha(\mu\| q)$ on $(1,z)$ and on $(1,\chi_{\mu,q})$. On the other hand, as a function of α, $D_\alpha(\mu\| q)$ is continuous from the left because it is increasing and lower semicontinuous. Hence, $D_\alpha(\mu\| q)$ is continuous in α on $(1,\chi_{\mu,q}]$.

In order to prove the continuity from the right at $\alpha=1$, first note that μ is absolutely continuous in q, i.e. $\mu\prec q$, because $D_z(\mu\| q)<\infty$. Then using the alternative expression for the Renyi divergence given in (25) together with the fact that $\ln x\leq x-1$ for all $x\in(0,\infty)$ we get

$$D_\alpha(\mu\| q)\leq\int\tfrac{1}{\alpha-1}\left[(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}q})^\alpha-\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}q}\right]q(\mathrm{d}y) \qquad \forall\alpha\in(1,z].$$

Let $\{\alpha^{(\imath)}\}$ be a sequence of real numbers in $(1,z)$ converging to one. Using l'Hospital's rule [58, Theorem 5.13] and the fact that $\frac{x^\alpha-x}{\alpha-1}$ is an increasing function of[53] α, we get

$$\tfrac{1}{\alpha^{(\imath)}-1}((\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}q})^{\alpha^{(\imath)}}-\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}q})\xrightarrow{q-a.e.}\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}q}\ln\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}q} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \tfrac{1}{\alpha^{(\imath)}-1}((\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}q})^{\alpha^{(\imath)}}-\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}q})\leq\tfrac{1}{z-1}((\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}q})^z-\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}q}).$$

Since $\int\frac{1}{z-1}\left|(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}q})^z-\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}q}\right|q(\mathrm{d}y)\leq\frac{e^{(z-1)D_z(\mu\| q)}+1}{z-1}<\infty$, we can apply the dominated convergence theorem [7, 2.8.1]:

$$\lim_{\imath\to\infty}\int\tfrac{1}{\alpha^{(\imath)}-1}((\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}q})^{\alpha^{(\imath)}}-\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}q})q(\mathrm{d}y)=\int\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}q}\ln\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}q}q(\mathrm{d}y).$$

Then $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} D_{\alpha^{(\imath)}}(\mu\| q) = D_1(\mu\| q)$ because $D_\alpha(\mu\| q)$ is increasing in α. Thus $D_\alpha(\mu\| q)$ is continuous from the right at $\alpha=1$.

(9-b) If $s\ll q$ then $s(\mathcal{E})\leq q(\mathcal{E})$ for all $\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{Y}$ and $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\| q)\leq D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\| s)$ for any finite partition $\mathcal{E}$ measurable in $\mathcal{Y}$ by the definition of $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\| q)$ given in (23). Then $D_\alpha(\mu\| q)\leq D_\alpha(\mu\| s)$ because of the definition of $D_\alpha(\mu\| q)$ given in (22).
If $q=\lambda s$ then $q(\mathcal{E})=\lambda s(\mathcal{E})$ for all $\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{Y}$ and $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\| q)=D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\| s)-\ln\lambda$ for any finite partition $\mathcal{E}$ measurable in $\mathcal{Y}$ by the definition of $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\| q)$ given in (23). Then $D_\alpha(\mu\| q)=-\ln\lambda+D_\alpha(\mu\| s)$ because of the definition of $D_\alpha(\mu\| q)$ given in (22).

(9-c) If $s\ll\mu$ then $s(\mathcal{E})\leq\mu(\mathcal{E})$ for all $\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{Y}$ and $(1-\alpha)D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\| q)\leq(1-\alpha)D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(s\| q)$ for any finite partition $\mathcal{E}$ measurable in $\mathcal{Y}$ by the definition of $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\| q)$ given in (23). Then $(1-\alpha)D_\alpha(\mu\| q)\leq(1-\alpha)D_\alpha(s\| q)$ as a result of the definition of $D_\alpha(\mu\| q)$ given in (22).
If $\mu=\gamma s$ then $\mu(\mathcal{E})=\gamma s(\mathcal{E})$ for all $\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{Y}$ and $(1-\alpha)D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\| q)=(1-\alpha)D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(s\| q)-\alpha\ln\gamma$ for any finite partition $\mathcal{E}$ measurable in $\mathcal{Y}$ by the definition of $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\| q)$ given in (23). Then the corresponding identity for $D_\alpha(\mu\| q)$ follows from the definition of $D_\alpha(\mu\| q)$ given in (22).

(9-d) If $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\| q)$ is convex in q for any $\mathcal{Y}$ measurable finite partition $\mathcal{E}$, then $D_\alpha(\mu\| q)$ is convex in q as a result of definition of $D_\alpha(\mu\| q)$ given in (22), because the pointwise supremum of a family of convex functions is itself convex. We prove in the following that $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\| q)$ is convex in q by analyzing four regimes given in the definition of $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\| q)$, separately.
- For $\alpha=0$, convexity follows from the convexity of the function $-\ln x$ in x and the Jensen's inequality.
- For $\alpha=1$, convexity follows from the convexity of the function $x\ln x$ in x and the Jensen's inequality.
- For $\alpha=\infty$ case, recall that the pointwise supremum of convex functions is itself a convex function. Then the convexity of $D_\infty^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\| q)$ in q follows from the convexity of the function $-\ln x$ in x the Jensen's inequality.
- For $\alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+\setminus\{1\}$ we analyze two cases separately:

[52] Since real numbers with its usual topology is a metric space we can restrict our attention to sequences $\{\alpha^{(\imath)}\}$ converging to zero by [53, Theorem 21.3].
[53] $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}\frac{x^\alpha-x}{\alpha-1}=\frac{ex}{(\alpha-1)^2}(\frac{x^{\alpha-1}}{e}\ln\frac{x^{\alpha-1}}{e}+\frac{1}{e})\geq 0$.

– For $\alpha \in (0,1)$ case as result of concavity of the functions x^α and $\ln x$ in x and the Jensen's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q_\beta) &= \tfrac{1}{\alpha-1}\ln \sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} (\mu(\mathcal{E}))^\alpha \left(\beta q_1(\mathcal{E}) + (1-\beta) q_0(\mathcal{E})\right)^{1-\alpha} \\ &\le \tfrac{1}{\alpha-1}\ln \sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} (\mu(\mathcal{E}))^\alpha \left(\beta \left(q_1(\mathcal{E})\right)^{1-\alpha} + (1-\beta)\left(q_0(\mathcal{E})\right)^{1-\alpha}\right) \\ &\le \beta\left(\tfrac{1}{\alpha-1}\ln \sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} (\mu(\mathcal{E}))^\alpha \left(q_1(\mathcal{E})\right)^{1-\alpha}\right) + (1-\beta)\left(\tfrac{1}{\alpha-1}\ln \sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} (\mu(\mathcal{E}))^\alpha \left(q_0(\mathcal{E})\right)^{1-\alpha}\right) \\ &= \beta D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q_1) + (1-\beta) D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q_0) \end{aligned}$$

– For $\alpha \in (1,\infty)$ case, first note that when either $q_0(\mathcal{E})$ or $q_1(\mathcal{E})$ is zero for an $\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}$ with positive $\mu(\mathcal{E})$ then convexity holds trivially. Thus we assume henceforth that if $\mu(\mathcal{E})$ is positive then both $q_0(\mathcal{E})$ and $q_1(\mathcal{E})$ are positive. Then using the fact that arithmetic mean is larger than the geometric mean, i.e. $q_\beta(\mathcal{E}) \ge (q_1(\mathcal{E}))^\beta (q_0(\mathcal{E}))^{1-\beta}$ for all $\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{Y}$ and Holder's inequity we get,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} (\mu(\mathcal{E}))^\alpha \left(q_\beta(\mathcal{E})\right)^{1-\alpha} &\le \sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} (\mu(\mathcal{E}))^\alpha \left((q_1(\mathcal{E}))^\beta (q_0(\mathcal{E}))^{1-\beta}\right)^{1-\alpha} \\ &\le \left(\sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} (\mu(\mathcal{E}))^\alpha \left(q_0(\mathcal{E})\right)^{1-\alpha}\right)^{\beta} \left(\sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} (\mu(\mathcal{E}))^\alpha \left(q_1(\mathcal{E})\right)^{1-\alpha}\right)^{1-\beta} \end{aligned}$$

Then the convexity of $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$ in q follows from its definition given in (23).

(9-e) If $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$ is quasi-convex in (μ, q) for any $\mathcal{Y}$ measurable finite partition $\mathcal{E}$, then $D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q)$ is quasi-convex in (μ, q) as a result of definition of $D_\alpha(\mu\|\, q)$ given in (22), because the pointwise supremum of a family of quasi-convex functions is itself quasi-convex. We prove in the following that $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$ is quasi-convex in (μ, q) by analyzing the four regimes given in the definition of $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$, separately:

- For $\alpha = 0$, as a result of the convexity of the function $-\ln x$ in x and the Jensen's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\ln \sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\mu_\beta(\mathcal{E})>0\}} q_\beta(\mathcal{E}) &\le -\beta \ln\left(\sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\mu_\beta(\mathcal{E})>0\}} q_1(\mathcal{E})\right) - (1-\beta)\ln\left(\sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\mu_\beta(\mathcal{E})>0\}} q_0(\mathcal{E})\right) \\ &\le -\beta \ln\left(\sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\mu_1(\mathcal{E})>0\}} q_1(\mathcal{E})\right) - (1-\beta)\ln\left(\sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\mu_0(\mathcal{E})>0\}} q_0(\mathcal{E})\right). \end{aligned}$$

  Then $D_0(\mu\|\, q)$ is jointly convex in its arguments and the quasi-convexity follows from the convexity.
- For $\alpha = 1$, joint convexity of $D_1(\mu\|\, q)$ in its arguments follows from the convexity of $x\ln x$ in x and the Jensen's inequality. The quasi-convexity follows from the convexity.
- For $\alpha = \infty$, note that

$$D_\infty(\mu_\beta\|\, q_\beta) = \bigvee\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} \tfrac{\beta\mu_1(\mathcal{E})+(1-\beta)\mu_0(\mathcal{E})}{\beta q_1(\mathcal{E})+(1-\beta)q_0(\mathcal{E})} \le \bigvee\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} \left\{\tfrac{\mu_1(\mathcal{E})}{q_1(\mathcal{E})} \vee \tfrac{\mu_0(\mathcal{E})}{q_0(\mathcal{E})}\right\} = D_\infty(\mu_1\|\, q_1) \vee D_\infty(\mu_0\|\, q_0)\,.$$

- For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{1\}$ we analyze two cases separately:
  – For $\alpha \in (0,1)$ as a result of the concavity of the function x^α and the Jensen's inequality we have

$$\left(\tfrac{\mu_\beta(\mathcal{E})}{q_\beta(\mathcal{E})}\right)^\alpha \ge \tfrac{\beta q_1(\mathcal{E})}{q_\beta(\mathcal{E})}\left(\tfrac{\mu_1(\mathcal{E})}{q_1(\mathcal{E})}\right)^\alpha + \tfrac{(1-\beta)q_0(\mathcal{E})}{q_\beta(\mathcal{E})}\left(\tfrac{\mu_0(\mathcal{E})}{q_0(\mathcal{E})}\right)^\alpha \qquad \forall \mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{Y} : q_\beta(\mathcal{E}) > 0.$$

  Then using the convexity of the function $-\ln x$ and the Jensen's inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu_\beta\|\, q_\beta) &\le \tfrac{1}{\alpha-1}\ln \sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} \left(\beta q_1(\mathcal{E})\left(\tfrac{\mu_1(\mathcal{E})}{q_1(\mathcal{E})}\right)^\alpha + (1-\beta) q_0(\mathcal{E})\left(\tfrac{\mu_0(\mathcal{E})}{q_0(\mathcal{E})}\right)^\alpha\right) \\ &\le \tfrac{\beta}{\alpha-1}\ln \sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} \left(q_1(\mathcal{E})\left(\tfrac{\mu_1(\mathcal{E})}{q_1(\mathcal{E})}\right)^\alpha\right) + \tfrac{(1-\beta)}{\alpha-1}\ln \sum\nolimits_{\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}} \left(q_0(\mathcal{E})\left(\tfrac{\mu_0(\mathcal{E})}{q_0(\mathcal{E})}\right)^\alpha\right) \\ &= \beta D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu_1\|\, q_1) + (1-\beta) D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu_0\|\, q_0)\,. \end{aligned}$$

  The quasi-convexity of the Renyi divergence in its arguments follows from its convexity in its arguments.
  – For $\alpha \in (1,\infty)$, joint quasi-convexity holds trivially when either $q_0(\mathcal{E})$ is zero for an $\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}$ with positive $\mu_0(\mathcal{E})$ or $q_1(\mathcal{E})$ is zero for an $\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{E}$ with positive $\mu_1(\mathcal{E})$. Thus we assume henceforth that if $\mu_\imath(\mathcal{E})$ is positive then $q_\imath(\mathcal{E})$ is positive for $\imath = 0$ and $\imath = 1$. Using the convexity of x^α in x and the Jensen's inequality we get

$$\left(\tfrac{\mu_\beta(\mathcal{E})}{q_\beta(\mathcal{E})}\right)^\alpha \le \tfrac{\beta q_1(\mathcal{E})}{q_\beta(\mathcal{E})}\left(\tfrac{\mu_1(\mathcal{E})}{q_1(\mathcal{E})}\right)^\alpha + \tfrac{(1-\beta)q_0(\mathcal{E})}{q_\beta(\mathcal{E})}\left(\tfrac{\mu_0(\mathcal{E})}{q_0(\mathcal{E})}\right)^\alpha \qquad \forall \mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{Y} : q_\beta(\mathcal{E}) > 0.$$

  Then using the definition of $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$ given in (23) we get

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu_\beta\|\, q_\beta) &\le \tfrac{1}{\alpha-1}\ln\left(\beta e^{(\alpha-1)D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu_1\|q_1)} + (1-\beta)e^{(\alpha-1)D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu_0\|q_0)}\right) \\ &\le D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu_1\|\, q_1) \vee D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu_0\|\, q_0)\,. \end{aligned}$$

(9-f) Any $\mathcal{Y}_2$ measurable finite partition of $\mathcal{Y}$ is also $\mathcal{Y}_1$ measurable. Thus $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{Y}_1}(\mu\|\, q) \ge D_\alpha^{\mathcal{Y}_2}(\mu\|\, q)$ by definition of the Renyi divergence as the supremum of $D_\alpha^{\mathcal{E}}(\mu\|\, q)$ over measurable finite partitions.

(9-g) We use the alternative expression for the Renyi divergence given in equation (25) together with Holder's inequality for $\alpha \in (0,1)$, reverse Holder's inequality for $\alpha \in (1,\infty)$, and the Jensen's inequity and the convexity of the function $x \ln x$ for $\alpha = 1$. Note that Holder's inequalities are strict unless they are applied for functions that are equal a.e.; similarly the Jensen's inequality is strict unless all the probability mass is at $x = 1$. For $\alpha = \infty$ note that if $\mu \neq q$ and $\mu, q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ then there exists a $\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $\mu(\mathcal{E}) > q(\mathcal{E}) \geq 0$.

(9-h) Using Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|q - \mu\| &= \int \left| \sqrt{\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}} - \sqrt{\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}} \right| \left(\sqrt{\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}} + \sqrt{\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}} \right) \nu(\mathrm{d}y) \\
&\leq \left[\int \left(\sqrt{\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}} - \sqrt{\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}} \right)^2 \nu(\mathrm{d}y) \right]^{1/2} \left[\int \left(\sqrt{\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu}} + \sqrt{\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}} \right)^2 \nu(\mathrm{d}y) \right]^{1/2} \\
&= \left[\left(\|q\| + \|\mu\| \right)^2 - 4 \left(\int \sqrt{\tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu} \tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}} \nu(\mathrm{d}y) \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} \\
&= \left[\left(\|q\| + \|\mu\| \right)^2 - 4 \|\mu\| \|q\| e^{-D_{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{\mu}{\|\mu\|} \middle\| \frac{q}{\|q\|} \right)} \right]^{1/2} \qquad (159)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\left\| \frac{\mu}{\|\mu\|} \right\| = 1$, $D_\alpha\left(\frac{\mu}{\|\mu\|} \middle\| \frac{q}{\|q\|} \right)$ is increasing in α by part (a). Then

$$D_{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\tfrac{\mu}{\|\mu\|} \middle\| \tfrac{q}{\|q\|} \right) \leq D_\alpha\left(\tfrac{\mu}{\|\mu\|} \middle\| \tfrac{q}{\|q\|} \right) \qquad \forall \alpha \geq \tfrac{1}{2}. \qquad (160)$$

On the other hand, $D_{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{\mu}{\|\mu\|} \middle\| \frac{q}{\|q\|} \right) = D_{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{q}{\|q\|} \middle\| \frac{\mu}{\|\mu\|} \right)$ and $\left\| \frac{q}{\|q\|} \right\| = 1$. Thus,

$$D_{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\tfrac{\mu}{\|\mu\|} \middle\| \tfrac{q}{\|q\|} \right) \leq D_\alpha\left(\tfrac{q}{\|q\|} \middle\| \tfrac{\mu}{\|\mu\|} \right) \qquad \forall \alpha \geq \tfrac{1}{2}. \qquad (161)$$

By the definition of the Renyi divergence given in equation (22) we have

$$D_\alpha\left(\tfrac{q}{\|q\|} \middle\| \tfrac{\mu}{\|\mu\|} \right) = \tfrac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} D_{1-\alpha}\left(\tfrac{\mu}{\|\mu\|} \middle\| \tfrac{q}{\|q\|} \right) \qquad \forall \alpha \in (0,1). \qquad (162)$$

Using equations (159), (160), (161) and (162) we get equation (29). The inequality in (30) follows from equation (29) because $e^{-x} \geq 1 - x$.

■

D. Proof of The Lemma on The Alternative Characterization of The Renyi Information

Proof of Lemma 10: For $\alpha = 0$, as a result of the definition of the order zero Renyi information given in (18) and the alternative expression for the order zero Renyi divergence given in (25) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
D_0(p \circ \mathcal{W} \| \, p \otimes q) &= -\ln \int \sum\nolimits_w p(w) \tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu} \mathbb{1}_{\{p_{[1]}(w|y) \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} > 0\}} \nu(\mathrm{d}y) \\
&= I_0(p; \mathcal{W}) - \ln \int \tfrac{\sum_{w: p_{[1]}(w|y) > 0} p(w)}{\underset{\mu_{1,p}}{ess\,\sup} \sum_{w: p_{[1]}(w|y) > 0} p(w)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{1,p}}{\mathrm{d}\nu} > 0\}} \tfrac{\mathrm{d}q}{\mathrm{d}\nu} \nu(\mathrm{d}y). \qquad (163)
\end{aligned}$$

Equations (34) and (35) follows from equation (163) and the definition of $q_{0,p}$ given in equation (32).

For $\alpha \in (0, \infty]$, equation (34) follows from the definition of the Renyi information given in (18), the alternative expression for the Renyi divergence given in (25) and the definition of the Renyi mean given in (32), by substitution. Using equations (33) and (34) we get,

$$D_\alpha(p \circ \mathcal{W} \| \, p \otimes q) = I_\alpha(p; \mathcal{W}) + D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,p} \| \, q) \qquad \forall \alpha \in (0, \infty].$$

On the other hand $q_{\alpha,p}$ is a probability measure by definition given in (32). Then $D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,p} \| \, q) \geq 0$ for any probability measure q, with equality only when $q = q_{\alpha,p}$, by Lemma 9-(g). Then for all $q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y})$ such that $q \neq q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ we have

$$I_\alpha(p; \mathcal{W}) < D_\alpha(p \circ \mathcal{W} \| \, p \otimes q) \qquad \forall \alpha \in (0, \infty].$$

Then equation (35) follows from equation (34).

Equation (36) follows from equation (35) because of the following identity

$$D_\alpha(p \circ \mathcal{W} \| \, p \otimes q) = D_\alpha(\mu_{\alpha,p} \| \, q) \qquad \forall p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}), \ \forall \alpha \in (0, \infty] \setminus \{1\}.$$

■

E. The Ergodic Theorem: A Tool For Determining The Renyi Capacity

For $\mathcal{W}^{[f]}$ described in Example 4 we have $D_\alpha(w\|\,\lambda)=D_\alpha(w_f\|\,\lambda)$ for all $w\in\mathcal{W}^{[f]}$. Thus by Lemma 13 we have

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}}\leq \sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}^{[f]}} D_\alpha(w\|\,\lambda)=D_\alpha(w_f\|\,\lambda)\,.$$

We prove the reverse inequality, $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}}\geq D_\alpha(w_f\|\,\lambda)$, using the Birkoff-Khinchin ergodic theorem [23, 8.4.1]. In particular, we show that there exists a sequence of priors $\{p^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ such that[54] $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\big(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}^{[f]}\big)\geq D_\alpha(w_f\|\,\lambda)$ for all $\alpha\in(0,\infty]$.

For any $\kappa\in\mathbb{Z}$ and $x\in\mathbb{R}$, $\mathtt{T}_x^\kappa$ is the transformation resulting from κ successive applications of $\mathtt{T}_x$. As a result of the definition of $\mathtt{T}_x$ given in (93), $\mathtt{T}_x^\kappa=\mathtt{T}_{\kappa x}$ for any $\kappa\in\mathbb{Z}$ and $x\in\mathbb{R}$. For any $g\in\mathcal{L}_1(\lambda)$, $x\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+$ let $\overline{g}_x^\imath$ be

$$\overline{g}_x^\imath(y)\triangleq\tfrac{1}{\imath}\sum\nolimits_{\kappa=0}^{\imath-1} g\circ\mathtt{T}_x^\kappa(y) \qquad\qquad =\tfrac{1}{\imath}\sum\nolimits_{\kappa=0}^{\imath-1} g(y-\kappa x-\lfloor y-\kappa x\rfloor).$$

For any $x\in\mathbb{R}$, the transformation $\mathtt{T}_x$ is measure preserving for the measure space $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y},\lambda)$; if in addition x is irrational then $\mathtt{T}_x$ is ergodic. Hence, for any $g\in\mathcal{L}_1(\lambda)$ and irrational real number x, $\overline{g}_x^\imath$ converges to $\int g\lambda(\mathrm{d}y)$ $\lambda-$almost everywhere by Birkoff-Khinchin Ergodic theorem [23, 8.4.1]:

$$\overline{g}_x^\imath\xrightarrow{\lambda-a.e.}\int g\lambda(\mathrm{d}y) \qquad\qquad \forall g\in\mathcal{L}_1(\lambda)\text{ and }\forall x\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\mathbb{Q}. \tag{164}$$

Let x be an irrational number that will be fixed for the rest of the proof. For any $\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+$, let $p^{(\imath)}$ be the prior that has equal probability mass on each probability measure corresponding to a $f\circ\mathtt{T}_x^\kappa$ for some $\kappa\in\{0,\ldots,(\imath-1)\}$. Then for any $\alpha\in\mathbb{R}^+$ we have

$$\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}(y)=\left(\tfrac{1}{\imath}\sum\nolimits_{\kappa=0}^{\imath-1}(f^\alpha\circ\mathtt{T}_x^\kappa)(y)\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \qquad =\left(\sum\nolimits_{\kappa=0}^{\imath-1}\tfrac{1}{\imath}f^\alpha\left(y-\tfrac{\kappa x}{\imath}-\lfloor y-\tfrac{\kappa x}{\imath}\rfloor\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}.$$

For $\alpha\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\{1\}$, we calculate the limit $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\big(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}^{[f]}\big)$ by calculating the limit $\lim_{\imath\to\infty}\big\|\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\big\|$. For $\alpha=1$ and $\alpha=\infty$ the result follows from continuity arguments.

(a) $\alpha\in(0,1)$ *case:* $\int f^\alpha\lambda(\mathrm{d}y)\leq\big(\int f\lambda(\mathrm{d}y)\big)^\alpha=1$, and hence $f^\alpha\in\mathcal{L}_1(\lambda)$, by the Jensen's inequality because the function z^α is concave in z for $\alpha\in(0,1)$. Thus as a result of equation (164) we have

$$\left(\tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}\right)^\alpha\xrightarrow{\lambda-a.e.}\int f^\alpha\lambda(\mathrm{d}y) \qquad\Rightarrow\qquad \tfrac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}\xrightarrow{\lambda-a.e.}\left(\int f^\alpha\lambda(\mathrm{d}y)\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}.$$

For any $\epsilon>0$ there exists a $\delta>0$ such that if $\lambda(\mathcal{E})<\delta$ for a $\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{Y}$ then $w_f(\mathcal{E})<\epsilon$, because $w_f\prec\lambda$. Since λ is invariant under translations and $\mathcal{W}^{[f]}$ is the set of all mod one translations of w_f, $\mu_{1,p}(\mathcal{E})<\epsilon$ whenever $\lambda(\mathcal{E})<\delta$, as well. Then $\{\mu_{\alpha,p}:p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}^{[f]}),\alpha\in(0,1]\}\prec^{uni}\lambda$ and $\{\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ is uniformly $\lambda-$integrable because $\mu_{\alpha,p}(\mathcal{E})$ is an increasing function of α for all $\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{Y}$ by Lemma 3-(b). Since almost everywhere convergence implies convergence in measure by [7, Theorem 2.2.3], using Lebesgue-Vitali convergence theorem [7, 4.5.4], we can conclude that $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}$ converges to $\big(\int f^\alpha\lambda(\mathrm{d}y)\big)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$ in $\mathcal{L}_1(\lambda)$, as well: $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}\xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}_1(\lambda)}\big(\int f^\alpha\lambda(\mathrm{d}y)\big)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$. Then $\lim_{\imath\to\infty}\big\|\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\big\|=\big(\int f^\alpha\lambda(\mathrm{d}y)\big)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$. Using the definition of Renyi information given in (18) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\Big(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}^{[f]}\Big)&=\tfrac{1}{\alpha-1}\ln\left(\int f^\alpha\lambda(\mathrm{d}y)\right)\\&=D_\alpha(w_f\|\,\lambda) \qquad\qquad \forall\alpha\in(0,1).\end{aligned}$$

(b) $\alpha=1$ *case:* The Renyi information is an increasing function of the order by Lemma 5. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{\imath\to\infty} I_1\Big(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}^{[f]}\Big)&\geq\liminf_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\Big(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}^{[f]}\Big)\\&=D_\alpha(w_f\|\,\lambda)\,. \qquad\qquad \forall\alpha\in(0,1).\end{aligned}$$

Since the Renyi divergence is an increasing and lower semicontinuous function of the order by Lemma 9-(a), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{\imath\to\infty} I_1\Big(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}^{[f]}\Big)&\geq\lim_{\alpha\uparrow 1} D_\alpha(w_f\|\,\lambda)\\&=D_1(w_f\|\,\lambda)\,.\end{aligned}$$

(c) $\alpha\in(1,\infty)$ *case:* We analyze the finite $\int f^\alpha\lambda(\mathrm{d}y)$ and infinite $\int f^\alpha\lambda(\mathrm{d}y)$ cases separately.

[54]For establishing $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}}\geq D_\alpha\big(w_f\|\,\lambda\big)$, finding a different sequence of priors for each order α in $(0,\infty]$ would have sufficed. The convexity of $(\alpha-1)C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}}$ is a consequence of the fact that there exists a sequence of priors $\{p^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ such that $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\big(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}^{[f]}\big)=C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}^{[f]}}$ for all orders α in $(0,\infty]$.

- If $\int f^\alpha \lambda(\mathrm{d}y) < \infty$ then $f^\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_1(\lambda)$ and $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda} \xrightarrow{\lambda} \left(\int f^\alpha \lambda(\mathrm{d}y)\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$ by equation (164) because almost everywhere convergence implies convergence in measure by [7, Theorem 2.2.3]. On the other hand, as a result of the concavity of the function $z^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$ in z for $\alpha \in (1,\infty)$ and the Jensen's inequality we have

$$\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}(\mathcal{E}) \leq \left(\tfrac{1}{\imath}\sum\nolimits_{\kappa=0}^{\imath-1} \int_{\mathrm{T}_x^\kappa \mathcal{E}} f^\alpha \lambda(\mathrm{d}y)\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}.$$

  Then uniform $\lambda-$integrability of $\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}$ follows from the translational invariance of λ and the $\lambda-$integrability of f^α following an argument similar to the one we have for $\alpha \in (0,1)$ case. Thus using Lebesgue-Vitali convergence theorem [7, 4.5.4] and the definition of Renyi information exactly the same way we did for $\alpha \in (0,1)$ case we get

$$\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\left(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}^{[f]}\right) = \tfrac{1}{\alpha-1}\ln\left(\int f^\alpha \lambda(\mathrm{d}y)\right) \qquad = D_\alpha(w_f \| \lambda) \qquad \text{if } \int f^\alpha \lambda(\mathrm{d}y) < \infty.$$

- If $\int f^\alpha \lambda(\mathrm{d}y) = \infty$ then we repeat the above analysis for $f \wedge \gamma$ for a $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^+$ instead of f. As a result we get,

$$\liminf_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\left(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}^{[f]}\right) \geq \tfrac{1}{\alpha-1}\ln\left(\int (f\wedge\gamma)^\alpha \lambda(\mathrm{d}y)\right) \qquad \forall \gamma \in (0,\infty)$$

  Note that as $\gamma \uparrow \infty$, $\int (f\wedge\gamma)^\alpha \lambda(\mathrm{d}y) \uparrow \int f^\alpha \lambda(\mathrm{d}y)$. Thus

$$\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\left(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}^{[f]}\right) = \infty \qquad \text{if } \int f^\alpha \lambda(\mathrm{d}y) = \infty.$$

(d) $\alpha = \infty$ *case:* Repeat the analysis for $\alpha = 1$ case by replacing $\alpha = 1$ and $(0,1)$ by $\alpha = \infty$ and $(1,\infty)$.

We have used the ergodic theorem [23, 8.4.1] in order to be able to conduct our analysis for arbitrary measurable functions. If we restrict our attention to functions that are bounded and continuous at all but finite number of points, we can choose $p^{(\imath)}$ to be the priors that have $2^{-\imath}$ probability mass on each probability measure corresponding to a $f\circ \mathrm{T}_{2^{-\imath}}^\kappa$ for $\kappa \in \{0,1,\ldots,(2^\imath-1)\}$. Then the identity $(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda})^\alpha \xrightarrow{\lambda-a.e.} \left(\int f^\alpha \lambda(\mathrm{d}y)\right)$ is a result of Riemann integrability of f^α rather than the ergodicity.

We have used the Lebesgue-Vitali convergence theorem [7, 4.5.4] instead of the dominated convergence theorem [7, 2.8.1]. That is a matter of taste; one can prove the same statements using the dominated convergence theorem. First, do the analysis for $\tilde{f} = f \wedge \gamma$ and then take the limit as γ diverges to infinity.

F. The Constrained Renyi Capacity

Definition 11. Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space, $\mathcal{W}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, and $\mathcal{A}$ be subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$. Then for any $\alpha \in [0,\infty]$, *the order α constrained Renyi capacity* is

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A}) \triangleq \sup_{p\in\mathcal{A}} I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})\,. \tag{165}$$

Evidently for any $\mathcal{W}$ and $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ we have

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\{p\}) = I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})\,.$$

Using the alternative characterization of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ given in equation (35) we get the following expression for $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A})$,

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A}) = \sup_{p\in\mathcal{A}} \inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q)\,. \tag{166}$$

Our analysis has been confined to the case when $\mathcal{A}$ is equal to $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$. Proofs for some of our results, however, are valid for more general $\mathcal{A}$'s, provided that we replace $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ with $\mathcal{A}$.

- Proofs of Lemma 11 and Lemma 12-(a,b,e) are valid as is for $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A})$ for any $\mathcal{A}$.
- Proof of Lemma 12-(f) is valid for any closed $\mathcal{A}$ because closed subsets of compact sets are compact, [53, 26.2].[55]
- Proof of Lemma 14 —except for equation (62)— is valid for any closed and convex $\mathcal{A}$.

For certain other results, by replacing $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ with an appropriately chosen $\mathcal{A}$ in the proofs, we get slightly weaker results for the constrained case. In particular, the proof of Theorem 1 works as is for convex $\mathcal{A}$'s and thus the minimax theorem continues to hold for $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A})$. But the alternative expression for $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A})$ is no longer (guaranteed to be) equal to the Renyi radius.

Theorem 2. *Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space, $\mathcal{W}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, $\mathcal{A}$ be a convex subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$. Then*

$$\sup_{p\in\mathcal{A}} \inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q) = \inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} \sup_{p\in\mathcal{A}} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q) \qquad \forall \alpha\in(0,\infty]. \tag{167}$$

[55] We assume $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ is equipped with the total variation topology. Lemma 12-(f) is valid for any $\mathcal{A}$, not just the closed ones. The proof of that fact, however, does not follow from the proof of Lemma 12-(f).

If $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A}) < \infty$ for an $\alpha \in (0,\infty]$, then there exists a unique $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ such that

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A}) = \sup_{p\in\mathcal{A}} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q_{\alpha,\mathcal{A}})\,. \tag{168}$$

Furthermore, for every sequence of priors $\{p^{(\imath)}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+} \subset \mathcal{A}$ satisfying $\lim_{\imath\to\infty} I_\alpha\big(p^{(\imath)};\mathcal{W}\big) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A})$, corresponding sequence of order α Renyi means $\{q_{\alpha,p^{(\imath)}}\}_{\imath\in\mathbb{Z}^+}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ for the total variation metric on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ and $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ is the unique limit point of that Cauchy sequence.

A similar modification is needed for Erven-Harremoes bound, i.e. Lemma 16, as well.

Lemma 22. *Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space, $\mathcal{W}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, $\mathcal{A}$ be a convex subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$, and α be an order in $(0,\infty]$. If $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A}) < \infty$ then*

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A}) + D_\alpha(q_{\alpha,\mathcal{A}}\|\, q) \le \sup_{p\in\mathcal{A}} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q) \qquad\qquad \forall q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y}). \tag{169}$$

Lemma 17 establishing the continuity of the Renyi centers in the order holds for the constrained Renyi centers. We use Theorem 2 and Lemma 22 instead of Theorem 1 and Lemma 16, in the proof.

Lemma 18 bounding the Renyi capacity of the unions and Lemma 19 determining the Renyi capacity of the Cartesian products can be generalized to the constrained case as Lemma 23 and Lemma 24, respectively. The proofs of lemmas in the constrained case are similar to the proofs of the original lemmas, but replacing $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$'s with $\mathcal{A}$'s is not sufficient on its own. We leave these two proofs to the reader.

Lemma 23. *Let $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be a measurable space, α be a positive order, $\mathcal{W}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, $\mathcal{A}^{(\imath)}$ be a convex subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})$ such that $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A}^{(\imath)}) < \infty$ for each integer $\imath\in[1,\kappa]$ and $\mathcal{A}$ be the convex hull of their union, i.e. $\mathcal{A} = \mathtt{ch}(\cup_{\imath=1}^{\kappa}\mathcal{A}^{(\imath)})$. Then*

$$\bigvee_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A}^{(\imath)}) \le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A}) \le \ln\sum\nolimits_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A}^{(\imath)})}. \tag{170}$$

Furthermore,

- $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A}^{(\imath)}) = C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A}) \Leftrightarrow \sup_{p\in\mathcal{A}} D_\alpha\big(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q_{\alpha,\mathcal{A}^{(\imath)}}\big) \le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{A}^{(\imath)}} \Rightarrow q_{\alpha,\mathcal{A}} = q_{\alpha,\mathcal{A}^{(\imath)}}$.
- $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A}) = \ln\sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A}^{(\imath)})} \Leftrightarrow q_{\alpha,\mathcal{A}^{(\imath)}} \perp q_{\alpha,\mathcal{A}^{(\jmath)}} \;\; \forall \imath\neq\jmath \Rightarrow q_{\alpha,\mathcal{A}} = \sum_{\imath=1}^{\kappa} \frac{e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A}^{(\imath)})} q_{\alpha,\mathcal{A}^{(\imath)}}}{\sum_{\jmath=1}^{\kappa} e^{C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A}^{(\jmath)})}}$.

Lemma 24. *Let $(\mathcal{Y}_t,\mathcal{Y}_t)$ be a measurable space, $\mathcal{W}_t \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}_t,\mathcal{Y}_t)$, and $\mathcal{A}_t$ be a convex subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}_t)$ for each $t\in\mathcal{T}$ where $\mathcal{T}$ is a finite index set. If $\mathcal{Y} = \prod_{t\in\mathcal{T}}^{\times}\mathcal{Y}_t$, $\mathcal{Y} = \prod_{t\in\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes}\mathcal{Y}_t$, $\mathcal{W} = \Big\{w : w = \prod_{t\in\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes} w_t : w_t\in\mathcal{W}_t\Big\}$, and $\mathcal{A} = \prod_{t\in\mathcal{T}}^{\times}\mathcal{A}_t$ then*

$$C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A}) = \sum\nolimits_{t\in\mathcal{T}} C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}_t}(\mathcal{A}_t) \qquad\qquad \forall\alpha\in(0,\infty]. \tag{171}$$

Furthermore, if $C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}(\mathcal{A}) < \infty$ for an $\alpha\in(0,\infty]$ then $q_{\alpha,\mathcal{A}} = \prod_{t\in\mathcal{T}}^{\otimes} q_{\alpha,\mathcal{A}_t}$.

G. The Renyi Capacity of Transition Probabilities

We have defined the order α Renyi information $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ for any p.m.f. p on a set of probability measures $\mathcal{W}$. We show in the following —using the concept of transition probability and the expression for $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ given in equation (35)— that for appropriately chosen $\sigma-$algebra $\mathcal{W}$ one can extend the definition of $I_\alpha(p;\mathcal{W})$ to p's that are probability measures on $(\mathcal{W},\mathcal{W})$. Furthermore, we show that if $\mathcal{W}$ is countably separated[56] then Theorem 1 holds for this more general case, see Theorem 3.

Let us start with recalling the definition of the transition probability.

Definition 12. Let $(\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{Z})$ and $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ be measurable spaces. Then a function $W : \mathcal{Z}\times\mathcal{Y}\to[0,1]$ is called a transition probability (a stochastic kernel / a Markov kernel) from $(\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{Z})$ to $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ if it satisfies following two conditions:

(i) For all $z\in\mathcal{Z}$, the function $W(z|\cdot) : \mathcal{Y}\to[0,1]$ is a probability measure on $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$.
(ii) For all $\mathcal{E}\in\mathcal{Y}$, the function $W(\cdot|\mathcal{E}) : \mathcal{Z}\to[0,1]$ is a $(\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{B}([0,1]))$-measurable function.

By [7, 10.7.2. Theorem], for any transition probability W and probability measure p on $(\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{Z})$ there exists a uniqueness probability measure $p\circ W$ on $(\mathcal{Z}\times\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Z}\otimes\mathcal{Y})$ such that

$$p\circ W(\mathcal{E}_z\times\mathcal{E}_y) = \int_{\mathcal{E}_z} W(z|\mathcal{E}_y)p(\mathrm{d}z). \qquad\qquad \forall\mathcal{E}_z\in\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{E}_y\in\mathcal{Y}.$$

Now, we can define the order α Renyi information for p on the transition probability W.

[56] A σ-algebra $\mathcal{Z}$ on $\mathcal{Z}$ is countably separated, [7, 6.5.1. Definition], if there exists an at most countable collection sets $\{\mathcal{E}_\imath\}\subset\mathcal{Z}$ separating the points of $\mathcal{Z}$. A collection $\{\mathcal{E}_\imath\}$ of subsets of $\mathcal{Z}$ is said to be separating the points of $\mathcal{Z}$, if for every pair of distinct points x and z in $\mathcal{Z}$ there exists an $\mathcal{E}_\imath$ which includes only one of x and z. The Borel σ-algebra of any separable metric space is countably separated. The Borel σ-algebra of any separable metric space is also countably generated, i.e. it is the minimum σ-algebra of a countable collection of sets.

Definition 13. For any transition probability W from $(\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{Z})$ to $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$, $p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{Z})$, and $\alpha\in[0,\infty]$,

$$I_\alpha(p;W)\triangleq\inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} D_\alpha(p\circ W\|\, p\otimes q)\,. \tag{172}$$

Definition 4 and Definition 13 are equivalent because of Lemma 10. Using the definition of $I_\alpha(p;W)$ we can define the order α Renyi capacity of a transition probability W.

Definition 14. For any transition probability W from $(\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{Z})$ to $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ and $\alpha\in[0,\infty]$,

$$C_{\alpha,W}\triangleq\sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{Z})} I_\alpha(p;W)\,. \tag{173}$$

The analysis of the Renyi capacity for an arbitrary transition probability W is beyond the scope of our investigation. However, if the σ-algebra $\mathcal{Z}$ is countably separated then we can use Theorem 1 to show that $C_{\alpha,W}=C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ for a $\mathcal{W}\subset\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$.

Theorem 3. *Let $\mathcal{Z}$ be a countably separated σ-algebra, W be a transition probability from $(\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{Z})$ to $(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ and α be an order in $(0,\infty]$. Then*

$$\sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{Z})}\inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} D_\alpha(p\circ W\|\, p\otimes q)=\inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})}\sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{Z})} D_\alpha(p\circ W\|\, p\otimes q) \tag{174}$$

$$=\inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})}\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} D_\alpha(w\|\, q) \tag{175}$$

where $\mathcal{W}\triangleq\{W(z|\cdot):z\in\mathcal{Z}\}$.

If $C_{\alpha,W}<\infty$ for an $\alpha\in(0,\infty]$ then there exists a unique $q_{\alpha,W}\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})$ such that

$$C_{\alpha,W}=\sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{Z})} D_\alpha(p\circ W\|\, p\otimes q_{\alpha,W}) \tag{176}$$

$$=\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} D_\alpha(w\|\, q_{\alpha,W})\,. \tag{177}$$

Proof of Theorem 3: Since $\mathcal{Z}$ is countably separated, all singletons are in $\mathcal{Z}$ by [7, 6.5.7. Theorem] and $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})\subset\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{Z})$. Consequently,

$$\sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W})}\inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} D_\alpha(p\circ\mathcal{W}\|\, p\otimes q)\le\sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{Z})}\inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})} D_\alpha(p\circ W\|\, p\otimes q) \tag{178}$$

On the other hand, for any $\alpha\in(0,\infty]$ as a result of Tonelli-Fubini theorem [23, 4.4.5] and the alternative expression for the order α Renyi divergence given in (25) we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha(p\circ W\|\, p\otimes q)&\le\sup_{z\in\mathcal{Z}} D_\alpha(W(z|\cdot)\|\, q)\\ &=\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} D_\alpha(w\|\, q)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{179}$$

Hence,

$$\inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})}\sup_{p\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{Z})} D_\alpha(p\circ W\|\, p\otimes q)\le\inf_{q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{Y})}\sup_{w\in\mathcal{W}} D_\alpha(w\|\, q)\,. \tag{180}$$

Theorem 1 and the inequalities given in (178), (179), and (180) imply $C_{\alpha,W}=C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ and Theorem 3 for $q_{\alpha,W}=q_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$. ■

Theorem 1 and equation (179) imply that $C_{\alpha,W}\le C_{\alpha,\mathcal{W}}$ even when $\mathcal{Z}$ is not countably separated.

Acknowledgment

Author would like to thank Fatma Nakiboğlu and Mehmet Nakiboğlu for their hospitality; this work simply would not have been possible without it. Author completed his initial study confirming the soundness of Augustin's method at UC Berkeley in 2012 fall while he was working as a post doctoral researcher under the supervision of Anant Sahai. Author would like to thank Anant Sahai for his mentorship and his endless patience with the ever forthcoming manuscript, Harikrishna R. Palaiyanur for sending him Augustin's manuscript, Imre Csiszár for pointing out Agustin's work [5] at Austin in 2010 ISIT, and Güneş Nakiboğlu for his suggestions on the manuscript.

References

[1] S. M. Ali and S. D. Silvey. A general class of coefficients of divergence of one distribution from another. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 28(1):131–142, 1966.
[2] E. Arikan. An inequality on guessing and its application to sequential decoding. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 42(1):99–105, Jan 1996.
[3] S. Arimoto. Information measures and capacity of order α for discrete memoryless channels. In I. Csiszár and P. Elias, editors, *Topics in Information Theory*, volume 16, pages 41–52. Math. Soc. J. Bolyai, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1977.
[4] U. Augustin. Error estimates for low rate codes. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, 14(1):61–88, 1969.
[5] Udo Augustin. *Noisy Channels*. Habilitation thesis, Universitat Erlangen, 852 Erlangen, West Germany, 1978. (https://goo.gl/8wupWM).
[6] S. G. Bobkov and G. P. Chistyakov. Entropy power inequality for the renyi entropy. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(2):708–714, Feb 2015.
[7] Vladimir I Bogachev. *Measure theory*, volume 1. Springer-Verlag, 2007.
[8] Pierre Bremaud. *Point Processes and Queues: Martingale Dynamics*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer New York, 1981.
[9] C. Bunte and A. Lapidoth. Encoding tasks and renyi entropy. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(9):5065–5076, Sept 2014.
[10] C. Bunte and A. Lapidoth. On the listsize capacity with feedback. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(11):6733–6748, Nov 2014.
[11] C. Bunte and A. Lapidoth. Maximum renyi entropy rate. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(3):1193–1205, March 2016.

[12] M. V. Burnashev and Yu. A. Kutoyants. On the sphere-packing bound, capacity, and similar results for poisson channels. *Problems of Information Transmission*, 35(2):95–111, 1999.
[13] Thomas M Cover and Joy A Thomas. *Elements of information theory*. Wiley-Interscience, 2 edition, 2006.
[14] I. Csiszár. Eine informationstheoretisehe ungleichung und ihre anwendung auf den beweis der ergodizität von markoffschen ketten. *Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutató Int. Közl.*, 8:85–108, 1963.
[15] I. Csiszár. Information-type measures of difference of probability distributions and indirect observations. *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.*, 2:299–318, 1967.
[16] I. Csiszár. On topological properties of f-divergences. *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.*, 2:329–339, 1967.
[17] I. Csiszár. A class of measures of informativity of observation channels. *Periodica Mathematica Hungarica*, 2(1-4):191–213, 1972.
[18] I. Csiszár. Arbitrarily varying channels with general alphabets and states. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 38(6):1725–1742, Nov 1992.
[19] I. Csiszár. Generalized cutoff rates and renyi's information measures. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 41(1):26 –34, Jan 1995.
[20] Imre Csiszár and János Körner. *Information theory: coding theorems for discrete memoryless systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
[21] M. Davis. Capacity and cutoff rate for poisson-type channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 26(6):710–715, Nov 1980.
[22] L. D. Davisson and A. Leon-Garcia. A source matching approach to finding minimax codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 26(2):166–174, Mar 1980.
[23] Richard M Dudley. *Real analysis and probability*, volume 74. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
[24] T. van Erven and P. Harremoes. Renyi divergence and kullback-leibler divergence. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(7):3797–3820, July 2014.
[25] A. A. Fedotov, P. Harremoes, and F. Topsoe. Refinements of pinsker's inequality. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 49(6):1491–1498, June 2003.
[26] S. Fehr and S. Berens. On the conditional renyi entropy. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(11):6801–6810, Nov 2014.
[27] S. L. Fong and V. Y. F. Tan. Strong converse theorems for classes of multimessage multicast networks: A renyi divergence approach. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(9):4953–4967, Sept 2016.
[28] R. G. Gallager. A simple derivation of the coding theorem and some applications. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 11(1):3–18, Jan. 1965.
[29] R. G. Gallager. Source coding with side information and universal coding. Tech. Rep. LIDS-P-937, MIT Lab. Inform. Decision Syst, September 1979. http://web.mit.edu/gallager/www/papers/paper5.pdf.
[30] Robert G. Gallager. *Information theory and reliable communication*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968.
[31] Robert G. Gallager. *Stochastic processes : theory for applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
[32] A. L. Garkavi. The best possible net and the best possible cross-section of a set in a normed space. *Am. Math. Soc., Transl., II. Ser*, 39:111–132, 1964.
[33] G. L. Gilardoni. On the minimum f-divergence for given total variation. *Comptes Rendus Mathematique*, 343(11):763 – 766, 2006.
[34] G. L. Gilardoni. Corrigendum to the note "on the minimum f-divergence for given total variation"[c. r. acad. sci. paris, ser. i 343 (2006) 763-766]. *Comptes Rendus Mathematique*, 348(5):299, 2010.
[35] G. L. Gilardoni. On pinsker's and vajda's type inequalities for csiszar's-divergences. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56(11):5377 –5386, Nov 2010.
[36] A. Guntuboyina, S. Saha, and G. Schiebinger. Sharp inequalities for f-divergences. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(1):104–121, Jan 2014.
[37] A. Gushchin and D. A. Zhdanov. A minimax result for f-divergences. In *From stochastic calculus to mathematical finance. The Shiryaev Festschrift. Allmost all papers based on the presentation at the second Bachelier colloquium on stochastic calculus and probability, Meatbief, France, January 9–15, 2005.*, pages 287–294. Berlin: Springer, 2006.
[38] E. A. Haroutunian. Estimates of the error probability exponent for a semicontinuous memoryless channel. *Problems of Information Transmission*, 4(4):37–48, 1968.
[39] E. A. Haroutunian. Lower bound for error probability in channels with feedback. *Problems of Information Transmission*, 13(2):36–44, 1977.
[40] D. Haussler. A general minimax result for relative entropy. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 43(4):1276–1280, Jul 1997.
[41] M. Hayashi and V. Y. F. Tan. Equivocations, exponents and second-order coding rates under various rényi information measures. *CoRR*, abs/1504.02536, 2015.
[42] S. W. Ho and S Verdu. Convexity/concavity of renyi entropy and alpha-mutual information. In *2015 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 745–749, June 2015.
[43] J. Jeon. A generalized typicality for abstract alphabets. *CoRR*, abs/1401.6728, 2014.
[44] Yu. M. Kabanov. The capacity of a channel of the poisson type. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 23(1):143–147, 1978.
[45] J. H. B. Kemperman. On the shannon capacity of an arbitrary channel. *Indagationes Mathematicae (Proceedings)*, 77(2):101–115, 1974.
[46] H. Komiya. Elementary proof for sion's minimax theorem. *Kodai Mathematical Journal*, 11(1):5–7, 1988.
[47] S. Kullback. A lower bound for discrimination information in terms of variation (corresp.). *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 13(1):126–127, January 1967.
[48] S. Kullback. Correction to a lower bound for discrimination information in terms of variation. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 16(5):652–652, September 1970.
[49] M. A. Kumar and I. Sason. Projection theorems for the renyi divergence on α-convex sets. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(9):4924–4935, Sept 2016.
[50] M. A. Kumar and R. Sundaresan. Minimization problems based on relative α-entropy i: Forward projection. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(9):5063–5080, Sept 2015.
[51] M. A. Kumar and R. Sundaresan. Minimization problems based on relative α-entropy ii: Reverse projection. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(9):5081–5095, Sept 2015.
[52] P. Mitran. On a markov lemma and typical sequences for polish alphabets. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(10):5342–5356, Oct 2015.
[53] J. R. Munkres. *Topology*. Prentice Hall Inc., 2000.
[54] Y. Polyanskiy and S. Verdu. Arimoto channel coding converse and renyi divergence. In *Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton), 2010 48th Annual Allerton Conference on*, pages 1327 –1333, Oct 2010.
[55] M. Raginsky. Empirical processes, typical sequences, and coordinated actions in standard borel spaces. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 59(3):1288–1301, March 2013.
[56] E. Ram and I. Sason. On renyi entropy power inequalities. *CoRR*, abs/1601.06555, 2016.
[57] A. Renyi. On measures of entropy and information. In *Proceedings of the 4th Berkeley Symposium on Mathematics, Statistics and Probability*, pages 547–561, 1960.
[58] Walter Rudin. *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*. McGraw-Hill, 1976.
[59] I. Sason. On the renyi divergence, joint range of relative entropies, and a channel coding theorem. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(1):23–34, Jan 2016.
[60] I. Sason and S. Verdu. Upper bounds on the relative entropy and renyi divergence as a function of total variation distance for finite alphabets. In *Information Theory Workshop - Fall (ITW), 2015 IEEE*, pages 214–218, Oct 2015.
[61] C. E. Shannon, R. G. Gallager, and E. R. Berlekamp. Lower bounds to error probability for coding on discrete memoryless channels. i. *Information and Control*, 10(1):65–103, 1967.
[62] Claude E Shannon and Warren Weaver. *The mathematical theory of communication*. University of Illinois Press, 1949.

[63] O. Shayevitz. On renyi measures and hypothesis testing. In *Information Theory Proceedings (ISIT), 2011 IEEE International Symposium on*, pages 894–898, July 2011.
[64] A. Yu Sheverdyaev. Lower bound for error probability in a discrete memoryless channel with feedback. *Problems of Information Transmission*, 18(4):5–15, 1982.
[65] Albert N. Shiryaev. *Probability*. Springer-Verlag Inc., 1995.
[66] R. Sibson. Information radius. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 14:149–160, 1969.
[67] Maurice Sion. On general minimax theorems. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 8(1):171–176, 1958.
[68] R. Sundaresan. Guessing under source uncertainty. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 53(1):269–287, Jan 2007.
[69] V. Y. F. Tan and M. Hayashi. Analysis of remaining uncertainties and exponents under various conditional renyi entropies. *CoRR*, abs/1605.09551, 2016.
[70] A. Teixeira, A. Matos, and L. Antunes. Conditional renyi entropies. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 58(7):4273–4277, July 2012.
[71] Bui Van Thanh. Semi-continuous arbitrarily varying channels with general state constraints. *ACTA MATHEMATICA VIETNAMICA*, 17(1):31–50, 1992.
[72] M. Tomamichel and M. Hayashi. Operational interpretation of renyi information measures via composite hypothesis testing against product and markov distributions. *CoRR*, abs/1511.04874, 2015.
[73] I. Vajda. Note on discrimination information and variation (corresp.). *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 16(6):771–773, November 1970.
[74] S. Verdu. α-mutual information. In *2015 Information Theory and Applications Workshop*, 2015.
[75] A. D. Wyner. Capacity and error exponent for the direct detection photon channel. i. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 34(6):1449–1461, Nov 1988.
[76] A. D. Wyner. Capacity and error exponent for the direct detection photon channel. ii. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 34(6):1462–1471, Nov 1988.